

PAUL'S APOSTOLATE AND MISSION

With Particular Reference to the
"Eschatological" Interpretation of
Oscar Cullmann, Anton Fridrichsen, and Johannes Munck

by

Norman Dunning Pott

A THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty of the University of Edinburgh
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Edinburgh, Scotland

1960



TO MY MOTHER AND FATHER

Whose lives were my introduction to Christ

Whose encouragement and support has been my
opportunity to study the Christian Faith

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During the period of research and composition required for this thesis, I have received valuable direction from three faculty advisors, Professors William Manson, James Stewart, and James Barr. I consider myself fortunate to have had the benefit of Professor Manson's insight and erudition for the few months before his death in April, 1958. It was he who focused my attention upon the subject of Paul's apostolic consciousness, sharing at the same time his enthusiasm for the pertinent contribution of Professor Johannes Munck. Professor Stewart has been a source of strength and encouragement throughout, and our discussions of various aspects of Paul's ministry have been enlightening. In acknowledging my debt for the interest and assistance of Professor Barr, I should like particularly to mention his guidance in delimiting the scope of my subject at a critical stage in my work.

Two other distinguished New Testament scholars have also made a personal contribution to my research. An interview with Professor Joachim Jeremias of the University of Göttingen provided many profitable insights and suggestions. I am especially grateful to Professor Johannes Munck of the University of Aarhus for a morning spent in discussing Paul's apostolate and mission, for the exchange of correspondence which followed this meeting, and for his willingness in providing information and unpublished material, which proved of immense

value. Although I can not agree with many of Professor Munck's most significant conclusions, this disagreement does not detract from my respect for his contribution to Pauline scholarship nor does it prevent me from recognising the stimulation which he has given to my study.

It is impossible here, to name all the other individuals who have been helpful in some way, but I would like to express particular appreciation to the library staffs of New College, the National Library of Scotland, and the University of Göttingen. Finally I would like to thank my wife. Her contribution can neither be assessed nor described except to say that without her whatever I have accomplished could not have been done.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
PART ONE, PAUL'S CONVERSION AND VOCATION	
I A Summary of the Views of Cullmann, Fridrichsen and Munck on Paul's Conversion	8
II The Ground of Paul's Persecution and Its Effect upon His Conversion and Subsequent Christian Ministry	10
III The Descriptions of Paul's Conversion and the Purpose of God in History	22
IV A Summary of the Views of Cullmann, Fridrichsen and Munck on Paul's Vocation	33
V Paul, the Steward of the Mysteries of God	37
VI Paul, the Skilled Masterbuilder	44
VII Paul, the Runner, the Priest, the Prisoner	52
VIII A Summary of Conclusions Reached in Part One	65
PART TWO, PAUL'S APOSTOLATE AND THE APOSTLES OF CHRIST	
I A Summary of the Views of Fridrichsen, Munck and Cullmann on Paul's Apostolate	70
II Paul's Demand for Equality with the Apostles	76
III The Twelve as the Commissioned Apostles of Christ	88
IV The False Apostles of II Corinthians 10 - 13	95
V The Application of the <u>Shaliah</u> Concept to the Extended Use of <u>Apostolos</u> in the Early Church	101
VI The Application of the <u>Shaliah</u> Concept to the Apostles of Christ	108

	Page
VII A Summary of Conclusions Reached in Part Two with Particular Reference to the Use of <u>Apostolos</u> in the Post-Apostolic Church	114
VIII Extended Notes	128
 PART THREE, PAUL'S MISSION AND THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY	
I A Summary of the Views of Fridrichsen, Munck, and Cullmann on Paul's Mission	134
II Galatians 2.7-9 as a Division of Gospel ,	145
III Galatians 2.7-9 as a Division of Mission	152
IV Galatians 2.7-9 as a Division of Territory	165
V Galatians 2.7-9 as a Partnership in the One Mission of the Church	181
VI An Evaluation of Cullmann's Exegesis of II Thessalonians 2.6.7	191
VII "The Fullness of the Gentiles" and "Representative Universalism"	200
VIII "The Fullness of the Gentiles" and the Offering for the Church of Jerusalem	208
IX "The Fullness of the Gentiles" and Paul's Witness before Caesar	216
X The Apostolic Ministry, the Mission of Paul and "The Fullness of the Gentiles" in Romans 9 - 11	223
XI A Summary of Conclusions Reached in Part Three	236
XII Extended Notes	242
CONCLUSION	251
 BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED	
I Primary Sources	253
II Secondary Sources	254

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS

A.F.	<u>The Apostolic Fathers</u> (ed. J.B. Lightfoot)
A.M.	"The Apostle and His Message," <u>Inbjudningar till Doktorspromotionerna, I</u> (1947) (A. Fridrichsen)
A.P.	<u>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament</u> (ed. R.H. Charles)
A.V.	Authorized Version (King James Version)
B.N.T.C.	<u>Black's New Testament Commentaries</u>
C.E.	"Le caractère eschatologique du devoir missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de S. Paul," <u>R.H.P.R.</u> , (1936) (O. Cullmann)
C.I.	<u>Christus und Israel</u> (J. Munck)
Dindorfius	<u>Flavii Josephi Opera</u> (ed. G. Dindorfius)
D.S.S.	<u>The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery</u> (ed. M. Burrows)
E.T.	<u>Expository Times</u>
H.D.B.	<u>Hastings Dictionary of the Bible</u>
I.C.C.	<u>International Critical Commentary</u>
J.B.L.	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>
J.T.S.	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
Loeb	<u>The Loeb Classical Library</u>
LXX	Septuagint
M.N.T.C.	<u>The Moffatt New Testament Commentary</u>
O.M.G.	<u>'Ošar Hammegillot Haggenuzôt</u> (ed. E.L. Sukenik, N. Avigad)
P.A.T.	"Paul, the Apostles, and the Twelve," <u>Studia Theologica</u> (1949) (J. Munck)
P.G.	<u>Patrologiae Graeca</u> (ed. J.P. Migne)
P.H.	<u>Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte</u> (J. Munck)
P.L.	<u>Patrologiae Latina</u> (ed. J.P. Migne)

- R.H.P.R. Revue d'histoire et de Philosophie religieuses
R.S.V. Revised Standard Version
T.W.N.T. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament
(ed. G. Kittel)
Z.D. The Zadokite Documents (ed. C. Rabin)
Z.N.W. Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

Abbreviations of Canonical Scriptures are taken from
W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of
the New Testament, pp. xxvii-xxviii.

Biblical quotations in Greek, unless otherwise cited, are
from Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. E. Nestle. Biblical
quotations in English, unless otherwise cited, are from the
R.S.V.

The designations of the Dead Sea Scrolls follow the
standard sigla.

INTRODUCTION

From the beginning of this century, there has been a deep concern in New Testament scholarship to rediscover the real Paul. The concept of Paul as a theologian writing dogmatic treatises was discredited, and the term Paulinism designating a system of thought had died. Through the work of Ramsay, Deissmann, and others, who relocated Paul in the environment of the first century Roman Empire, the necessity for interpreting Paul first of all as a missionary was asserted. But even when this requirement is recognised and accepted, there are still countless obstacles. The same pitfalls that fashioned Paul into a nineteenth century theologian could as easily make him the twentieth century missionary.

Further questions must therefore be raised. In what sense is Paul a missionary? What is his outlook; his strategy; his position in the church? The challenge is to penetrate what has often been termed Paul's apostolic consciousness. Attempts to resolve these questions have not been lacking, although even a cursory survey reveals a divergence of opinion. Scholars such as Wernle, Lohmeyer, and particularly Rengstorf find the answer in Paul's recovery of the prophetic vocation, revealing itself in his complete surrender to a commission, his avoidance of any high estimate of man, and his acceptance of the absolute importance of God. Another approach is Schweitzer's interpretation of Paul as a mystic whose mission is governed at every point by the belief that the Messianic kingdom is coming soon to full

realization. Then there is the more controversial view of Reitzenstein and Windisch who see Paul as the high priest of the Christian mystery religion.

The question of Paul's strategy has been a particular interest of Dibelius. He enumerates six centers where Paul chose to concentrate his mission in order to facilitate the systematic spread of Christianity through the Empire. Similarly C.H. Dodd attributes to Paul the vision of a Christian Commonwealth incorporating members of all races and classes into Christ. Other scholars such as Riddle and J. Knox have been principally concerned with methodology. Emphasizing the superior value of primary sources they reject the Acts concept of the missionary journey and make predominant use of the Epistles to plot the stages of Paul's career.

The work of Baur demonstrated that Paul's share in the mission of the church could not be comprehended until one first defined his relation to the original apostles and the church of Jerusalem. W.L. Knox gives the clearest presentation of the view that Paul espoused an attitude and outlook that were initiated by Stephen and the Hellenists, rejected by Jerusalem and later championed in the mixed community of Antioch. Holl is prepared to acknowledge the distinctive character of Paul's ministry to the Gentiles, but nevertheless he joins Paul to the other commissioned representatives of Christ, and observes the centrality of Jerusalem in his thought and action. A totally different construction is put forth by Gaechter who believes that Paul derives his assignment and authority from

the pillar apostles.

With the appearance of Oscar Cullmann's article, "Le caractere eschatologique du devoir missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de S. Paul" in the Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses in 1936, comes a new approach to these problems. The key for interpreting Paul's apostolic consciousness, insists Cullmann, is the eschatological conviction of the early church that the parousia of Christ and the dawn of the Messianic Age must be preceded by the preaching of the gospel to the world. Paul who has been called by God to be an apostle to the Gentiles sees himself as the vital link in the chain of events. The character and strategy of the mission which he pursues are wholly determined by this "eschatological necessity".

Cullmann's observations raise the question of how Paul's vocational consciousness relates to the other apostles of the church. Do they also view themselves as persons specially elected by God to play decisive roles in the time preceding the End? Do they like Paul see their work in the context of God's purpose of salvation in the last days? Cullmann answers that the others have an eschatological perspective, but they do not connect themselves and their mission so concretely to God's plan; their consciousness has neither the clarity nor intensity of Paul's.

Several of these implications are expanded by Anton Fridrichsen in an article entitled "The Apostle and His Message," which appeared in the Inbjudningar till Doktors promotionerna of Uppsala University in 1947. Building on Cullmann's foundation,

Fridrichsen interprets Paul as an apostle, a person called by God to prepare the parousia of Christ through world mission. Fridrichsen believes that this eschatological usage of the term "apostle" is unique and original with Paul. However, Paul regards Peter as an apostle in this sense because he sees that Peter's call to the Jews, like his own mission among the Gentiles, has a decisive significance in the final series of salvation events. Gradually, "apostle" in this distinctly Pauline cast comes to be applied to the other eleven disciples as well. The most noteworthy interpretation of Fridrichsen is his idea that Paul is equipped with a specifically Gentile gospel for his special mission, just as Peter preaches a particularly Jewish-type gospel in his field. Though their messages are grounded in a common tradition, each would be inadequate in the other's territory.

The eschatological view of Paul's apostolate and mission comes to comprehensive expression with the publication of Johannes Munck's Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte in 1954. Munck, in the pattern of Cullmann and Fridrichsen, conceives Paul's conversion and call as a summons to play a vital role in the history of God's redemptive acts for mankind. Indeed, Paul is the central figure in this history because not only the salvation of the Gentiles, but also the final conversion of the Jews depends upon his work. "The Fullness of the Gentiles" which is the goal of his mission is the eschatological signal for the turning of the Jews to Christ.¹ By reaching a representative number of Gentiles,

¹ This interpretation of Paul's eschatological perspective has received support from Munck's detailed exegesis of Ro. 9-11, Christus und Israel, which was published in 1956.

Paul hopes to achieve this goal; later, however, he attempts to precipitate the End by bringing delegates from all his Gentile churches to Jerusalem with an offering, and finally he sees that his witness before the emperor in Rome will effect "The Fullness of the Gentiles".

According to Munck, Paul regards Peter, the Apostle to the Jews, as the second person who is called to an eschatological task in the last time.¹ Along with the other disciples of Jesus, Peter concentrates his efforts on the Jews, expecting that their conversion will occasion the salvation of the Gentiles. This eschatological outlook is thus precisely the reverse of Paul's, but the two apostles are able to cooperate through an agreement which divides the mission of the church. Peter and the eleven are to center their attention upon the Jews of the eastern diaspora (including the Pauline communities founded there) while Paul is to go to the Gentiles in the remainder of the Empire. This division lasts until Paul's death. Although the work of the Twelve among the Jews fails to produce results, Paul recognises that the Jews' rejection provides the opportunity for the Gentiles' reception of Christ, which in turn will provoke the final conversion of the Jews.

2 In his article "Paul, the Apostles, and the Twelve", which appeared in Studia Theologica in 1949, Munck traces the development of the usage of "apostle" in much the same way as Fridrichsen. The term is used of messengers and missionaries sent out by Christ, but not until Paul has employed "apostle" to designate his unique eschatological task is it ever applied to Peter and the other disciples of Jesus.

Therefore Paul achieves a harmonious relationship with those who are concerned in the mission to the Jews, and his opposition does not come from Peter, James, or any of the members of the Jerusalem church. Its origin is rather to be traced to misconceptions that arise independently in his own communities.

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the issues which have been raised by Cullmann, Fridrichsen, and Munck in order to determine whether their eschatological view of Paul can be sustained. It is recognised, however, that these issues involve not only a particular theory regarding Paul but also a reinterpretation of the "apostle" concept and a redefining of the mission of the early church. Therefore the issues are most clearly expressed by posing three sets of questions relating to (1) Paul's conversion and vocation, (2) the New Testament idea of "apostle", and (3) the conduct of the apostolic mission.

(1) From the perspective of his conversion and vocational consciousness, does Paul conceive himself to be a person called to a special ministry which he connects with God's plan of salvation in the time before the End? (2) Does the New Testament idea of the "apostle" support the view that Paul initiates the concept of a person commissioned by Christ for world mission in the last days? Is this allegedly unique Pauline sense of "apostle" then applied to Peter and gradually to all the Twelve? (3) Do the relations between Paul and the other leaders of the early church reveal a difference of eschatological viewpoint and a division of mission responsibility and territory? Does Paul's pursuit of his own task indicate that he regards

his work as determinative for "The Fullness of the Gentiles", the conversion of Israel, and the return of Christ?

The content of this thesis is arranged in three parts which correspond to the respective subjects of the above questions. Each of these parts includes a more detailed summary of the material which Cullmann, Fridrichsen and Munck have contributed to the eschatological interpretation of Paul's apostolate and mission. This is followed by an examination of source material most pertinent to the question concerned together with an attempt at its solution. In his review of Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte, Professor William Manson expressed the hope that Munck's position would not be dismissed before it had been fully considered and discussed.¹ Accordingly the conclusions reached in this thesis are not intended to close these vital questions but rather to contribute to such a discussion.

1 Scottish Journal of Theology, IX (1956), 305.

PART ONE

PAUL'S CONVERSION AND VOCATION

KILLSTON

EDWARD STRONG

A Summary of the Views of Cullmann, Fridrichsen, and Munck
on Paul's Conversion

In his article on ἀποστολος in Kittel's Worterbuch, Rengstorf has expressed in the strongest possible terms the significance of Paul's conversion: "It is thus clear that Paul's apostolic consciousness is completely determined by his encounter with Jesus on the way to Damascus."¹ The scholars who are giving an eschatological interpretation to Paul's apostolate and mission generally accept this approach. Fridrichsen sees Paul's specific ministry to the Gentiles developing after the Damascus experience but this event is still termed "original" and "fundamental" to his call.² Cullmann speaks of the "intense consciousness which originates in the conversion and finds itself stimulated further by the polemic of the Judaisers against his apostolate."³ However, of the three scholars, Munck alone presents an extensive treatment of Paul's conversion as such.⁴

Munck views the Damascus event as a totally unexpected, unprepared "breakthrough" of the purpose of God into the life of Paul.⁵ This is evident from two factors which are integral to the conversion accounts in both Acts and the Epistles. The first concerns his life before the encounter with Christ. He has had no

1 K.H. Rengstorf, Apostleship, trans. J.R. Coates, p. 54.

2 A. Fridrichsen, A.M., p. 13.

3 O. Cullmann, C.E., p. 241.

4 J. Munck, P.H., pp. 1-27.

5 Ibid., pp. 5, 10, 15, 16.

inclination or gradual development towards the new faith by virtue of his background in Judaism, Hellenism, or on the basis of a prior contact with Christianity.¹ On the contrary, he is always represented as apprehended by Christ from the conviction of Pharisaism as regards the Law, and from the task of a persecutor as regards the church.²

The second factor relates to expressions from the prophetic calls of the O.T. (LXX) which are used to interpret Paul's conversion experience in Gal. 1.15, 16; Acts 26.17, 18; 9.15, 16; 22.14, 15.³ These parallels do not justify including the Damascus event in the category of the O.T. prophetic visions. Rather they indicate a similarity between Paul and the O.T. prophets in their relation to the saving purpose of God in history.⁴ As with the prophets, God's will is impressed upon Paul, not through the determination of any conditioning elements, but purely by an act of the divine grace.

Because both these factors, (1) Paul as Pharisee and persecutor, and (2) Paul as a divinely chosen vehicle of God's historic purpose of salvation are common to Acts as well as the Epistles, Munck accepts the reliability of the Acts accounts and traces their origin to Paul's own impression of his conversion.⁵

1 Ibid., p. 1.

2 Ibid., pp. 2-5, 118.

3 Ibid., pp. 15-20.

4 Ibid., pp. 17-25.

5 The Pauline origin of the Acts accounts has been skillfully defended by A. Wikenhauser, "Die Wirkung der Christophanie vor Damaskus auf Paulus und seine Begleiter nach den Berichten der Apostelgeschichte," Biblica, XXXIII (1952), 313-323, who, on the basis of numerous parallels from ancient literature, has accounted for the differences in these accounts by referring to

The Ground of Paul's Persecution and its Effect upon his Conversion and Subsequent Christian Ministry

With his first factor, Paul's former life as a Pharisee and persecutor, Munck intends to eliminate the possibility of Paul the Jew having any positive disposition toward Christianity. He simply attributes the Damascus experience to a divine act and counters any attempt to give a human explanation to Paul's sudden transition from persecutor to apostle.¹ An examination of the Biblical evidence bearing on Paul's pre-conversion period lends strong support to Munck's case. It also reveals that Paul's persecution can not be separated from his Pharisaism but is the natural product of his zeal for the Law. The meaning of this persecution indicates that Paul's predisposition to Christianity

Luke's particular style and purpose in Acts. His argument is directed against the study of E. Hirsch, "Die drei Berichte der Apostelgeschichte über die Bekehrung des Paulus," Z.N.W., XXVIII (1929), 305-312, who, after applying Source Criticism to the three accounts, accepts only Acts 26 as a genuine reflection of Paul's view.

1 Baur considered the task of historical criticism in treating Paul's conversion, "...to investigate, if what in itself is possible, did actually occur in accordance with the statements before us, without the interposition of a special miracle." F.C. Baur, Paul, trans. by E. Zeller, I, 78. This trend reaches its climax in Holsten's attempt to psychologize Paul's conversion, C. Holsten, Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus, pp. 3-64. However the most effective analyses of determining factors of the pre-conversion period by English speaking scholars have maintained the divine intervention at Damascus: W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 45f., 59, 60; A.S. Peake, "The Quintessence of Paulinism," The Servant of Yahweh, pp. 238f.; J.S. Stewart, A Man in Christ, pp. 81-126. This corresponds to the conclusions of P.E. Pfaff, Die Bekehrung des H. Paulus in der Exegese des 20 Jahrhunderts, pp. 171-173 who has surveyed the interpretations which have been given to Paul's conversion in the course of this

was negative in the extreme. Munck has therefore rightfully rejected any positive inclination toward the new faith on the part of Paul, but he has not assessed the possible influence of this negative predisposition on Paul's subsequent apostolic consciousness.¹

The elements conditioning Paul before Damascus have been usually viewed as an attraction to the Christian witness and its proponents simultaneous with a failure in the Jewish Law. However the recent exegesis of the passages most often used to defend this hypothesis, Acts 26.14; Ro. 7.7-25, has not favored such an interpretation of the pre-conversion period.

σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν, Acts 26.14, probably does not indicate a yielding of conscience to the Christian position but has been seen as a common Greek and Latin proverb expressing the futility of resistance to fate.² Assuming the origin of Acts 26 in Paul's own account of the conversion, the Apostle employs the saying before an exceptionally cosmopolitan audience, Acts 25.23,

century. Pfaff cites two predominant viewpoints. First there are those who deny the supernatural character of the experience and account for it either with a natural explanation or by means of Source Criticism. Secondly, there are those who admit the miracle but see factors conditioning Paul for its occurrence. One effect of Munck's work is to demonstrate that the miracle can be accepted without positing these pre-conditioning factors. Cf. C.V. Weizsäcker, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, trans. J. Millar, I, 82, 83.

1. In his exegesis of Ro. 9-11, Munck is favorable to the suggestion that Paul's personal experience of God's grace revealed in the midst of his bitter persecution might well be the basis upon which he anticipates the coming salvation of Israel. Thus he admits the possibility of Paul's negative predisposition determining his Christian consciousness but does not develop the point, J. Munck, C.I., p. 81.

2 H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, I, 939; K. Lake, H.J. Cadbury, Translation and Commentary, The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F.J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, Pt. I, IV, 318f.

to refer to the fact that his strenuous persecution did not defeat the realization of the purpose of God at Damascus. It is not the preparation for conversion that is in view but rather the impression of the event itself as he came to understand it after subsequent reflection.¹

Neither does Ro. 7.7-25 necessarily indicate a pre-conversion failure of Paul in the Law. If it has reference to Paul's position in Judaism, this statement of the inadequacy of the Law is almost surely made from the perspective of God's grace as revealed in the Christian faith. Thus Bultmann writes that "Ro. 7.14-21 is not a confession of Paul describing his erstwhile inner division under the Law, but is that picture of the objective situation of man-under-the-Law which became visible to him only after he had attained the viewpoint of faith."² This interpretation is supported by the argument of Goguel that Paul's pre-conversion position in the Law

1 W. Michaelis, Das Neue Testament, I, 107. J. Munck, P.H., pp. 10f., gives the proverb a futuristic rendering, "...from now on you will not be able to resist the fate that I, Christ have imposed upon you." But this specialized sense is not supported (1) by the occurrences of the proverb in Greek literature, where it has a past and present as well as a future context, (2) by the present tense forms δύναται and ἀσχύεται, Acts 26.14, and (3) by Paul's conception of God's plan for him. It is not something imposed at Damascus and proceeding from this time, but rather it begins ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου, Gal. 1.15. His persecution, though prior to Damascus could therefore be considered a resistance to this divine will.

2 R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, trans. K. Grobel, I, 266; Cf. also G.F. Moore, Judaism, III, 150f.; J.H. Ropes, The Apostolic Age, p. 111. This seems to be the only answer to the accusations of Jewish scholars that Paul omitted the doctrine of repentance in the Law. Thus J. Klausner, From Jesus to Paul, trans. W.F. Stinespring, pp. 518f.; E.I. Jacob, "Paul," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. by I. Landman, VIII (1948), 415; Cf. G.F. Moore, loc. cit. God's offer of mercy despite the failure of the individual receives particular emphasis in the Qumran literature. Cf. 1 Q.S. 11.12 (D.S.S., II:2), "As for me, if I slip, God's mercy is my salvation forever, and if I stumble in the guilt of the flesh my vindication through the righteousness of God will stand eternally." W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 144, says that Ro. 7 does not relate to the Torah at all, but is rather Paul standing under the ethical absolute of Christ.

is not to be found in Ro. 7 but rather in Phil. 3.6, κατὰ

δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἀμεμπτος .¹

Faced with this lack of Biblical support, several scholars on the basis of modern psychology relegated these predetermining factors to the subconscious level. They manifest themselves outwardly in the intensity of Paul's persecution but only burst into consciousness at Damascus.² However this psychological approach is negated by the fact that the zeal of Paul's persecution can be explained on the level of consciousness as the revulsion of his Jewish faith before the Christian witness.

When Paul speaks of his attainment in the law and his persecution of the church, they are not isolated entities but the natural related products of his Jewish stand. In Gal. 1.13,14 his former life, τὴν ἑμὴν ἀναστροφὴν, is introduced as the evidence of divine intervention rather than human influence in his Christian origin, following Gal. 1.11,12.³ The two coordinate characteristics set in apposition (ὅτι) to τὴν ἑμὴν ἀναστροφὴν are his attempted persecution and destruction of the church, ἐδίωκον, ἐπόρθουν, and his surpassing attainment in Judaism, προέκοπτον, both of which are explained by his zeal, περισσύτερος ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων, for the traditions of the fathers. Therefore this zeal not only stimulated his former religious distinction but also inspired his persecution of the

1 M. Goguel, "Remarques sur un aspect de la conversion de Paul," J.B.L., LIII (1934), pp. 257f.

2 G.J. Inglis, "The Problem of St. Paul's Conversion," E.T., XL (1929), pp. 228f.; also H.H. Wendt, Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, pp. 214f.

3 H. Lietzmann, Galaterbrief, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, p. 230.

Christian faith.¹

In Phil. 3.5,6 his extraordinary achievement in Judaism and his persecution of the church are again cited in parallel construction with *κατὰ* as giving rise to his confidence in the flesh, vs. 3, prior to the entrance of Christ in his life, vs. 7. Here it is expressly stated that his persecution was the measure of his Jewish *ζήλος*. *κατὰ ζήλος διώκων* is therefore not used in irony,² nor is it an indication that Paul was a Zealot.³ This view is denied by the probability that Paul was a Jew of the diaspora and a Roman citizen, Acts 22.3,28. There is no evidence that the activity of his pre-conversion period included the political agitation which characterized the party of Zealots and which finally culminated in the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70. Although the zeal which stirred an increasing number of Jews to action against Rome stemmed from the religious obligation to protect the honor of God, it is not justified to treat every manifestation of *ζήλος* as a political expression nor every occurrence of *ζηλωτής* as a party designation.⁴

1 Most commentators, J.B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, p. 81., E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, I.C.C., pp. 46f. refer *περισσότερος ζηλωτής υπάρχων* exclusively to the latter phrase *καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συναλικίως ἐν*

τῷ γένει μου, concerning Paul's advancement over his fellows, but it seems more plausible that *υἰάρχων*, a Circumstantial Participle of Cause, is the ground for the action expressed in *ἐδίωκον* and *ἐπόρθουν* as well as *προέκοπτον*. Cf. A.T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, p. 1128. This exegesis is supported by the use of the comma between vs. 13 and 14 in Nestle's text, whereas Souter separates the two phrases with a full stop.

2 Contr. M.R. Vincent, The Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon, I.C.C., p. 98, and J.B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, p. 148.

3 Contr. E. Lohmeyer, Die Briefe an die Philipper, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, p. 130.

4 W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, A Greek - English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 338 who observe that in addition to the absolute sense, the word appears "with additions indicating what the *ζηλωτής*

Paul obviously considered that Christianity and not the government was the real threat to God's honor. Thus Bernard Weiss has interpreted κατὰ ζήλον διώκων correctly when he says, "... , and he (Paul), as no other, had proved his zeal for the Law through this, that he had become a persecutor of the church, which in the eyes of unbelieving Judaism was considered the community of opposition to the Law;..."¹

A ζήλος that gives rise to personal piety in the Law while at the same time arousing violent action against the enemies of the Law has its roots in the O.T. ζήλος in the LXX translates the Hebrew נָצַח (נָצַח the Hebrew verb נָצַח) and, applied to men, is used as (1) a descriptive term in human relationships, (2) in the context of married life, (3) with a specialized meaning where it becomes "the passionate, consuming jealousy which directs itself toward God, or more precisely the carrying out of God's will, the upholding of God's honor in the face of godless deeds of men and peoples."²

The examples of this specialized ζήλος are particularly instructive for interpreting the nature of Paul's persecution. In Numb. 25 a Midianite woman illegally brought into the Israelite camp, as well as the guilty party, are killed by the priest Phinehas. Because of this expression of zeal for God, ἐνθ' ὧν ἐζήλωσε τῷ Θεῷ, vs. 13, LXX, Phinehas averts the visitation of divine

ardently desires to join, promote, actively support, possess or defend." Cf. also C. Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, trans. S.H. Hooke, pp. 169-171; F.J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, "The Zealots," The Beginnings of Christianity, I, 421-425.

1 B. Weiss, Philipper-Brief, p. 229. Parentheses mine.

2 A. Stumpff, "ζήλος," T.W.N.T., ed. G. Kittel, II, 880.

wrath upon the people and is rewarded with the covenant of eternal priesthood. Elijah speaks of his extreme zeal for the Lord in I Kgs. 19.10 ἐξήλωκα τὸ Κυρίον, LXX, following his announcement of the severe famine and the slaying of the prophets of Baal, I Kgs. 17, 18. Finally II Kgs. 10.15-18 has Jehu inviting Jehonadab to witness his zeal for the Lord, ἴδε ἐν τῷ ζηλωταί με τὸ Κυρίον, vs. 16, LXX, which is revealed as he wipes out the remaining members of the house of Ahab.

The Apocrypha and the Rabbinic literature show that Phinehas and Elijah were singled out in Judaism as primary examples of ζῆλος¹ and they are always remembered in the context of the violent deeds which demonstrated their passion for God. Sir. 48.2 states that, "Elijah brought a famine among them and by his zeal (τὸ ζῆλον αὐτοῦ LXX) made them few in number." In I Macc. 2.54, "Phineas, because he was exceedingly zealous (ἐν τῷ ζηλωταί ζῆλον, LXX) received the everlasting covenant."² Rabbi Eliezer mentions Elijah and Phinehas together as examples of zeal for God.³ In the comment on the action of Phineas in the Midrash it states, "This serves to teach you that a man must be as fierce as a leopard, swift as an eagle, fleet as a hart, and

1 Undoubtedly Jehu is excluded because of his later unfaithfulness, II Kgs. 10.30, 31.

2 Cf. also I Macc. 2.58; Sir. 45.23.

3 Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, (trans. G. Friedlander, p. 213). However because of the revolutionary anarchistic conclusions which the Zealots drew from these texts, the later Rabbis dissented from the positive interpretation of the zeal of Elijah and Phineas. Cf. S. Schlechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, pp. 204f.

strong as a lion in the performance of his Maker's will."¹

This special meaning of ζήλος is undoubtedly in Paul's mind as he speaks of his former life in Judaism, Gal. 1.13, 14; Phil. 3.5, 6. Though he makes general use of ζήλος and ζηλώ in both their good and bad connotation,² the only other possible occurrence of this specialized usage is in Ro. 10.2 where he speaks of Jews who have a zeal for God, ὅτι ζήλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν and yet can resist the Christian faith, Ro. 9-11. A striking example appears however in the account of the conversion in Acts 22. Paul, referring to his background in Judaism, characteristically cites his zeal for God,³ ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων τοῦ θεοῦ, and its manifestation in a persecution to the death, ἐδίωξα ἄχρι θανάτου. Moreover he compares his former zeal to that of the Jews who form his audience on that particular day, καθὼς πάντες ὑμεῖς ἐστε σήμερον. From the context we see that it is a zeal that culminates, as it did for Phinehas and Elijah, in a murderous intent toward that which is deemed foreign to the Law and people of God, Acts 22.23; 23.10, 12.

This evidence certainly supports Munck's contention that Paul prior to Damascus felt no attraction whatsoever to the

1 Midrash: Num. R. 25.b. (Midrash Rabbah, Numbers, trans. and ed. by H. Freedman, M. Simon, II, 824).

2 Cf. II Cor. 11.2; Ro. 13.13.

3 Of the three conversion accounts in Acts, Acts 22 is an apology delivered before Jews in the Aramaic tongue, ἀπολογίας... τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ, Acts 22.1, 2. Cf. H.J. Holtzmann, Die Apostelgeschichte, Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, I, 408f.

Christian faith. "Both these impetuses, his position within Judaism and his opposition to Christianity as a persecutor, lead individually and in connection with one another to the conclusion that he was drawn to Damascus, not only without any preparation for Christ, but as one who, in a quite special degree, was immune to the gospel."¹

But we must not let the matter rest here. For once it is recognised that Paul's persecution is the natural outgrowth of his position in Judaism, it is presupposed that the witness of Christianity affected this position in such a way as to produce the violent action. Granted that this predisposition toward Christianity is negative in the extreme, there has nevertheless occurred in Paul a coming to grips with the new faith and an assessment of its particular threat to Judaism.

To Paul the Jew, Christianity would corrupt the concept of the people of God, for in Christ God had revealed himself to those on the fringe of the Law,² to the Galilean "Am-ha-ares" rather than the "Perushim".³ Moreover the worship of the Temple was threatened for already Stephen and his followers had repudiated the permanent house of God and located the divine presence in Christ, Acts 7.44-60.⁴ Finally Christianity, in offering forgiveness and remission of sins in Christ, represented a challenge to

1 J. Munck, P.H., p. 5.

2 M. Dibelius, W.G. Kummel, Paul, trans. F. Clarke, pp. 51f.

3 E. Schurer, A History of the Jewish People, trans. by S. Taylor, P. Christie, Pt. II, II, 3-20.; G.F. Moore, op. cit., I, 60-62.

4. See Supplementary Sheet, note 1.

the validity of the Law itself.¹ The threat to the Jewish faith therefore centered in Christ himself, and this undoubtedly was the most repugnant element of Christianity in the mind of Paul, "That a man of common origin, a teacher of very doubtful orthodoxy, a wretched fanatic, obviously abandoned by God, should have been elevated to the Messianic glory after his shameful death."² This belief that a man obviously under God's curse, Gal. 3.13, was the Messiah would be considered by Paul as blasphemy which might well bring the wrath of God on the whole nation.³ Responding like Phinehas and Elijah, Paul sets out to purge Israel of this foreign element,⁴ to struggle to maintain the unity of the people of God

1 E. Lohmeyer, Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie, pp. 198f. C.H. Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach," The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XVII (1933), 9-14 has shown how the Christian faith would be intolerable before Paul's pride, καδχημα, in the Law. However Dodd has not considered this sufficient grounds to account for Paul's persecution but has explained his violence as the outward manifestation of a personal failure in the Law which Dodd finds in Ro. 7.

2 J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, trans. and ed. F.C. Grant, I, 187, 188. When Paul speaks of Christ's cross as a σκάνδαλον to the Jews, I Cor. 1.23; Gal. 5.13, it is out of the Jewish reaction to his preaching, but most probably his own pre-conversion experience is in the background, thus E.D. Burton, op. cit., p. 288; S.G.F. Brandon, The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church, pp. 69-71; Cf. also Acts 26.23 in the context of Paul's description of his conversion. For evidence that the Jews did not expect the Messiah both to suffer and die, cf. H.L. Strack, and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, II, 273-279. That Christ's suffering and death continued as a formidable obstacle in the witness of Christianity to the Jews is seen in Justin, Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo, LXXXIX 1, 2; XC 1 (P.G., VI, 688, 689).

3 M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, trans. H.C. Snape, p. 82.

4 Note that the action of Phinehas is viewed as an atonement in Numb. 25.13, וְכִפֵּר עַל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

under the Law in anticipation of the Messianic Age.

Once we have seen these forces motivating Paul's persecution, there is a danger of eliminating the miraculous from his conversion after the pattern of Baur, and, like Dibelius¹ or Goguel² viewing Damascus as a psychological meeting point of such issues. As Prof. Stewart remarks, "It must not however be imagined that when you have traced the conflict you have explained the conversion."³ Neither can we support Machen's view that Damascus is not so much the discovery of new facts as the reinterpretation of old ones.⁴ Rather Damascus presents itself to Paul not as reinterpretation but as a revelation, ἀποκάλυψις, Gal. 1.16, of God's grace coming in an appearance of the risen Christ, I Cor. 15.8, and a call to apostolic mission, Eph. 3.1-13.

We must not think, however, that this revelation is the filling of a vacuum. Rather it bursts into a climate of thought and action determined by the driving forces of Paul's persecution and demands a reappraisal of the issues involved. Though Paul receives his gospel and mission by revelation, this reception is facilitated because the encounter with Christ meant that God had indeed revealed himself beyond the law, Gal. 4.4, 5, and on the

1 M. Dibelius, W.G. Kummel, op. cit., p. 52.

2 M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, p. 85 who also employs the conscious, subconscious distinction.

3 J.S. Stewart, op. cit., p. 122.

4 J.G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 67, 145.

fringe of the chosen people, Ro. 10.12, 13. This accounts for the fact that Paul, though instructed in Judaism from his youth, was able to see the universal application of the gospel more readily than the Twelve, who had been trained by Jesus and had also received a commission to the world, Acts 10.9 - 11.18; Gal. 2.11-18.

But transcending all else in significance, the revelation to Paul at Damascus produces in the Apostle the strongest consciousness of identity with Christ. As God's minister in the act of proclaiming the word of reconciliation, τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς, Paul stands in the stead of Christ, ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ,¹ before the world, II Cor. 5.19, 20; 6.1. This gives him the highest possible authority in the Gentile churches, I Thess. 1.6; I Cor. 5.4; 11.1; II Cor. 13.3. But pursuing his mission in the face of intensive persecution and opposition, this identification impresses itself upon Paul's consciousness even more as a union in the weakness, suffering, and death of Christ, Gal. 6.14-17; I Cor. 4.9-13; II Cor. 4.7-12; Phil. 1.29, 30; 3.10. In speaking of Paul's identification with Christ in weakness, καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς δοθενοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, II Cor. 13.4, Ernst Käsemann writes, "This certainly does not distinguish Paul from the rest of Christendom, for to them the δοθενοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, 13.4, is not less valid, but it is still true

¹ Lietzmann renders ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ "for Christ's sake," H. Lietzmann, Korinther I, II, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, p. 126., but Bousset and Wendland are correct in saying that "in Christ's stead" makes better sense in the context of προσβέβουμεν. However the concept of ambassador would not exclude Lietzmann's meaning. W. Bousset, Der zweite Brief an die Korinther, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, p. 190. H.D. Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, pp. 182f.

that to him this peculiar characteristic of the Christian position becomes visible in particular clarity."¹

Käsemann does not attempt to account for this but surely one explanation is that God's initial revelation of Christ to Paul comes precisely at a time when the weakness, suffering and death of Christ stand vividly in his mind driving him to the persecution of the church. Paul reacts to God's grace by taking the full burden of the σκάνδαλον upon himself, I Cor. 2.2.

III

The Descriptions of Paul's Conversion and the Purpose of God in History

The second factor supporting Munck's view of Damascus as an unconditioned act of God's grace, consists in the many parallels he has indicated between the O.T. prophetic calls and the N.T. accounts of Paul's conversion. Paul's use of these O.T. expressions certainly requires such an interpretation and also supports Munck's acceptance of the Acts accounts. Perhaps his greatest contribution at this point, however, has been to recognise that the essential parallel between Paul and the prophets is not a similar psychological structure, vision, or ministry, but

¹ E. Käsemann, "Die Legitimität des Apostels," Z.N.W., XII (1942), 56. Thus also S.G.F. Brandon, op. cit., pp. 69-71.

rather a relation to God's will:¹ "When Paul applies these Biblical expressions to his own conversion, he must mean that he thereby not only clarifies God's call to himself, but also that this call like Jeremiah's and Second Isaiah's is a renewing of God's saving purpose for the Gentiles, which designates him a place in the "Heilsgeschichte" on the same line with these O.T. figures."²

We have in these parallels, therefore, an indication of the Apostle's own interpretation of his conversion, and also a basis for evaluating the comparisons that have often been made between Paul and these O.T. prophetic figures. Furthermore these expressions illuminate a feature of Paul's conversion which is integral to the N.T. accounts and which has only been implied by Munck: Damascus to Paul is not a point in time but an event that is continuous in its effects; through an appearance of the risen Christ, it is a sudden insight into the whole saving purpose of God in the world and the beginning of a personal and responsible relationship to that purpose.³

1 J. Munck, P.H., pp. 17-25.

2 Ibid., p. 17.

3 That Damascus for Paul is a beginning rather than an isolated event is evident from his frequent use of the analogy of creation to describe the salvation experience, II Cor. 5.17; Gal. 6.17; Eph. 2.10; 4.24. In II Cor. 4.6 this analogy is employed with reference to his own conversion, not with $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$ or $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ but with a paraphrase, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \sigma\kappa\acute{o}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \phi\acute{o}\varsigma\ \lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\epsilon\iota$, of God's command in Gen. 1.3. Cf. W. Bousset, op. cit., p. 180. A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, pp. 33f. has shown that conversion as an inclusive event is foreign to the N.T. as a whole.

It is significant that the O.T. expressions utilized by Paul are derived from Second Isaiah¹ and Jeremiah who mark the culmination of the prophetic movement. To communicate the deepest significance of his conversion experience, Paul has therefore chosen characteristics which belong to these latter prophets in a pre-eminent sense.

The expressions indicate first that Paul shares with these prophets the strongest consciousness of divine action in his relationship with God. This heightened God consciousness permeates Second Isaiah,² Is. 40.12-15, 28; 43.10; 45.5-7, 18, and in Is. 49.1 manifests itself in an awareness of personal predestination expressed by the Servant of Yahweh. For Jeremiah the consciousness of God is the essence of religion, Jer. 9.23-26.³ It too is impressed upon him by this sense of being known by Yahweh from his mother's womb, which Skinner defines as "a conviction formed within, an intuitive perception of the divine ideal and meaning of his existence, of his true place in the divine order of the world, of the work for which he is

1 This assumes that the Ebed Yahweh Songs, from which the parallels to Paul's experience are taken, are the composition of Second Isaiah. For a discussion of this controversial issue cf. C.R. North, The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, pp. 156-188., also J. Mullenburg, "Introduction, Chs. 40-66," The Interpreters Bible, V, 406f. It does not necessarily follow of course that the Servant is to be identified with Second Isaiah.

2 E. Pace, Ideas of God in Israel, pp. 106f.

3 A. Guillaume, Prophecy and Divination, pp. 344f.

cut out in the service of God and of His kingdom."¹

It is to convey this consciousness of a dynamic relation to the will of God that Paul employs ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου in Gal. 1.15, and the dominant note of God's action in his conversion is carried by the two participles ἀφορίσας, καλέσας and the infinitive ἀποκαλῆσαι.

Secondly, the expression ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Gal. 1.16, and its equivalent in Acts 26.17, 18, εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε, ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, which are taken from Jer. 1.5,7 and Is. 42.1,6,7; 49.6, reveal a connection between Paul and these O.T. figures in relation to God's will for the Gentiles. Because of this apparent similarity of commission, Rengstorf represents Jeremiah as Paul's great prototype in regard to his apostolic consciousness.² However neither the ministry of the prophets nor of Paul justifies carrying the parallel this far.

Jer 1.5 does not signify a missionary call to the nations but rather that the fate of Israel has become so bound up with the political destiny of its neighbours, that what was formerly a national prophecy assumes international proportions.³ Not only Israel's history but the whole course of world events is viewed as "the earthly reflection of a heavenly drama."⁴ In

1 J. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, p. 27.

2 K.H. Rengstorf, op. cit., pp. 56-60.

3 H.W. Robinson, The Old Testament, Its Making and Meaning, p. 101., also J. Skinner, op. cit., p. 30. The Hiphil Perf. יְהוָה יְבָרֵךְ Jer. 1.10, signifies an extension of Yahweh's authority to the nations through his appointed representative Jeremiah. Cf. a parallel usage Jer. 40.5, 7, 11; Gen. 39.5

4 H. Knight, The Hebrew Prophetic Consciousness, p. 166. Cf. Ibid., pp. 162-171.

this drama the prophet never becomes a missionary to the heathen, but always the intermediary between Yahweh and Israel, addressing Yahweh's message to corporate Israel, preparing Israel to become the vehicle of Yahweh's salvation to the nations.¹

On the other hand, Paul views himself as an actual instrument fulfilling through his mission God's saving purpose for the Gentiles, Gal. 2.7,8; Ro. 1.1-5; 15.14-21; Col. 1.24-29. In speaking of his commission, *οἰκονομίαν* in Eph. 3.1f., the full share of the Gentiles in the gospel, vs. 6, is a *μυστήριον* which was not made known, *οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη* to former generations, but has now been revealed, *νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη* to the apostles. When we balance the prophetic expressions of Gal. and Acts with these passages, any comparison of Paul and Jeremiah or Second Isaiah on the basis of mission consciousness or content of ministry must be rejected, and we must be content like Munck to draw attention only to a common relation to the purpose of God to reach beyond Israel.

Finally, in its context, the expression *ἐξαποστέλλειν σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν*, Acts 26. 17,¹ corresponding to Jer. 1.8,

1 J. Skinner, *op. cit.*, p.7. D.P. Volz, *Prophetengestalten des Alten Testaments*, pp. 38, 136, 137, 318 recognizes that the prophetic universalism is never separated from Israel, and yet Volz represents Second Isaiah as the personal founder of a world mission. However, C.R. North, *op. cit.*, pp. 196f. has effectively argued that a Gentile mission goes beyond the scope of the prophet's ministry. The fact that the Servant actually becomes the bearer of salvation to the Gentiles in Is. 42.6,7; 49.6 seems a strong argument against Volz's identification of the Servant with Second Isaiah or with any of the prophets. Cf. also H.H. Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*, pp.7f.

2 Munck finds the parallel to these expressions in Acts 9.16 and an implied parallel in Acts 22.14,15, J. Munck, *P.H.*, p. 19.

signifies that to Paul as well as these latter prophets, the will of God is something more than what is communicated in an initial experience. It is permanently impressed upon them and becomes a sustaining and compelling force through their entire ministry. On the basis of Rudolf Kittel's work,¹ Rengstorf sees Jeremiah as the supreme example of this identification of the prophet with God's will, so that God's word becomes not only his message but his authority and strength, Jer. 15.19-21; 20.7-13; the nation's opposition to God manifests itself in their rejection of God's prophet and becomes the cause of Jeremiah's continued suffering, Jer. 11.18-21; 15.10-18; 20.14-18. The comparison to Paul is then expanded along these lines.²

However, Rengstorf, in drawing these parallels, appears again to have separated Jeremiah too far from his prophetic context. His comparison stands on the premise that in Jeremiah we have a disappearance of the ecstatic element characterising the earlier prophets and the full awakening of the prophetic ego, so that the prophet emerges as a religious thinker.³ But the majority of scholars, though admitting a lessening of the ecstatic element in the great prophets, still see traces of ecstasy in the visions, symbolic actions, and abnormal experiences of Jeremiah which maintain his continuity with the earlier Nabi, Jer. 1.1-10; 23.9;

1 R. Kittel, The Religion of the People of Israel, trans. R.C. Micklem, pp. 152ff.

2 K.H. Rengstorf, op. cit., pp. 56-58.

3 K.H. Rengstorf, op. cit., p. 56f.

27.2 - 28.10; 42.7.¹ Therefore we can only say that Paul like Jeremiah is conscious that God's will is effective beyond its first manifestation, but we must be extremely cautious before attributing the Prophet's particular experience of God's will to the Apostle.²

There is no prophetic expression used in the descriptions of the conversion in the Epistles which corresponds to Acts 26.17; 9.16. However the idea of a movement of the divine communication beyond the moment of conversion so that it becomes a permanent, compelling, and sustaining force is quite evident. In I Cor. 15.1-11 where Paul adds the Damascus revelation to the list of the post-resurrection appearances,³ this movement is expressed by $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$. Despite his unworthiness revealed in his persecution of the church, vs. 9, he has nevertheless been named

1 H.W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, pp. 173f. Cf. also W.O.E. Oesterley and T.H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development, pp. 193f.; N.W. Porteous, "Prophecy," Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson, p. 233.; H. Knight, op. cit., pp. 70f. This continuity is particularly evident in the call of the Prophet, Jer. 1.10. The mysterious representation of the initial imparting of God's word in Jer. 1.9 conveyed by the Hiph'il and Prepositional Phrase, 'ע-ל מל'ל establishes the connection to the prophetic experience, Ez. 2.8 - 3.3; Is. 6.7. In Is. 6.7 'ע-ל מל'ל is more of a purification.

2 E. Lohmeyer, Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie, p. 203 has shown that Paul's use of the term "Apostle" rather than "Prophet" requires us to regard him in a totally unique perspective.

3 J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, p. 351.; J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, pp. 116f.

an apostle, χάριτι δὲ Θεοῦ, vs. 10. But not only was this χάρις manifest at the moment of conversion in making an apostle of the enemy of Christ, but it has been the means by which Paul has outworked his contemporaries in the apostolic mission, οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ ἀλλὰ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ οὖν ἐμοί. In his monograph on χάρις, G.P. Wetter writes of this usage in I Cor. 15.10, "That χάρις in this remark can not be a disposition, nor mean 'favour,' is evident from the context; he thinks of it as a concrete objective power proceeding from God, which takes possession of man and acts in and with him."¹

In Phil. 3.12 the divine purpose which seized Paul at Damascus is not only the basis of his Christian ministry but also his goal. The passive form καταλήμφθην in the Aorist tense almost surely refers to his conversion² following the enumeration of Paul's attainments in Judaism, which are now accounted as ζημίαν in his identification with Christ, Phil. 3.1-11. ἐπὶ in ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ καταλήμφθην ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ could either denote cause (R.S.V.) or purpose (A.V.). Both ideas are involved for certainly Christ's work is the basis upon which

1 G.P. Wetter, Charis, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ältesten Christentums, p. 47. Wetter also sees this idea of divine power predominant in δόξα used in the context of Paul's conversion in II Cor. 4.6, Ibid., p. 48. Cf. above, p. 23, n. 3. H.D. Wendland, op. cit., p. 123 has a similar view of χάρις in I Cor. 15.10.

2 J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, p. 152.; M. Dibelius, Thessalonicher I, II und Philipper, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, p. 60.

Paul strives, but εἰ καὶ καταλάβω still suggests a definite quest which has no real object unless we take ἐφ' ᾧ as in the A.V., "that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus."¹

"The fulfillment of the ideal contemplated by Christ when he transformed him from a persecutor to an apostle is the goal which invites him."²

In Gal. 1.15,16 we have already seen that what we ordinarily refer to as Paul's conversion is actually a description of God's activity beginning ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου and extending into his ministry, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. This movement of divine action has been obscured by the majority of commentators, who, in speculating over ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, vs. 15, have framed an alternative between "a subjective revelation in and for the apostle and an objective manifestation of Christ in and through him to others."³ The alternative is based, however, on two false distinctions, one between a subjective and objective revelation and the second between conversion and apostolic vocation. Paul's consciousness embraces all of these choices.

1 E.F. Scott, "Exegesis of Philippians," The Interpreters Bible, XI, 88. Lightfoot, loc. cit., also prefers this sense as does A.T. Robertson, op. cit., p. 605, who gives Eph. 2.10 and Gal. 5.13 as examples of a similar use of ἐπί.

2 M.R. Vincent, op. cit., p. 108.

3 E.D. Burton, op. cit., p. 50. Also J.B. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 82f., R.A. Lipsius, Der Brief an die Galater, Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, II, 20.

Damascus is both an appearance of the risen Christ, I Cor. 9.1; 15.1-11, as well as an identification with Christ, Phil. 3.12; II Cor. 4.4. In Gal. 1.15,16 this is evident from the fact that Paul attributes the experience to God's grace, "ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ ... καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλέσθαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί. When Paul uses χάρις in the context of his call he contemplates far more than a single momentary supernatural act. χάρις is a gift of God that enables Paul to procure obedience to the faith in the course of his mission, Ro. 1.5. The pillar apostles recognised χάρις as the divine force accrediting the results of Paul's work, Gal. 2.9. Indeed, as we have noted, χάρις is the power by which Paul claims to have surpassed the attainments of his colleagues in the apostolic mission, I Cor. 15.10. Therefore the use of χάρις in Gal. 1.15 would suggest that there is no distinction in Paul's mind between Christ revealed to him at Damascus and Christ revealed through him during his subsequent ministry.¹

Furthermore Burton's claim that ἀποκαλέσθαι, vs. 16, can only refer to an initial revelation of Christ to Paul rather than a continuous presentation of Christ through Paul, is based on too narrow a definition of the word.² Certainly the resurrection appearance at Damascus is a unique revelation of Christ, but Eph. 3.1-11 shows that the fulfilling of the apostolic ministry

¹ H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, pp. 25f. has interpreted χάρις in this sense in Gal. 1.15. G.J. Inglis, "St. Paul's Conversion in his Epistles," Theology, XXIV (1937), 219 has rightly suggested that instead of the subjective - objective distinction which would have had no meaning for Paul, it was the difference between a significant and illusory vision that concerned him.

² E.D. Burton, op. cit., pp. 50, 433f.

is bound up with this revelation so that even the reception of the gospel by the Gentiles can be considered ἀποκάλυψις, Gal. 3.23; 1 Th. 2.13. This corresponds to the view of Oepke and Cullmann that the revelation of God in Christ extends beyond the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus, since it is also evident in the witness of the apostles and in the response of their converts.¹

In the same way the apostolic vocation is not subsequent to the conversion, but is, on the contrary, prior to Paul's Christian experience, ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς μου, vs. 15. It is joined to the purpose of God which suddenly becomes apparent to Paul when he is seized by Christ at Damascus. His call to the Gentiles is therefore attributed to the working of the divine χάρις at the time of his conversion, ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων ἀγίων ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη, τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελισοῦσθαι, Eph. 3.8.² As Moffatt has expressed it: "For himself it must be remembered,

1 A. Oepke, "καλοῦμαι," T.W.N.T., III, 588. Speaking of "the period of direct revelation," O. Cullmann, The Early Church, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, p. 76 writes, "It comprises the years from the birth of Christ to the death of the last apostle, that is, of the last eye-witness who saw the risen Jesus and who received, either from the incarnate Jesus or the risen Christ, the direct and unique command to testify to what he had seen and heard."

2 That Eph. 3.8 refers to the conversion is indicated by the Aorist ἐδόθη but even more by the phrase τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων Paul uses ἐλάχιστος of himself only one other time, 1 Cor. 15.9, Ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων, where it has explicit reference to his former life as a persecutor, διότι ἐδίωκα. The comparison of these two verses justifies the conclusion that the χάρις in Eph. 3.8 which designates Paul an apostle to the Gentiles is identical and contemporaneous with that χάρις revealed to the persecutor at Damascus. χάρις appears with an Ingressive Aorist with specific reference to Paul's call to the Gentiles in four other locations: Gal. 2.9; 1 Cor. 3.10; Ro. 1.5; 15.15. J. A. Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, pp. 225f. has collected 20 references where χάρις is used in the context of Paul's Gentile mission.

what we call personal religion was the same thing as apostolic vocation; he always regarded his religious life under the Lord as from the first a summons to service."¹

Therefore, within the framework of Paul's own impressions of his conversion, Gal. 1.15,16 describes the purpose of God which involves the offering of salvation to the Gentiles through the mission of the Apostle, suddenly evident to Paul in the appearance of the risen Lord, and permanently impressed upon him through a spiritual identification with Christ. It is an objective vision which has a continuous subjective effect. It is a conversion which can in no way be distinguished from the beginning of an apostolic vocation. This is the foundation block of his case for the divine origin of his gospel, Gal. 1.11,12.

IV

A Summary of the Views of Cullmann, Fridrichsen, and Munck on Paul's Vocation

In regard to Paul's consciousness of his apostolic vocation, Cullmann, Fridrichsen, and Munck have made their most significant contribution. They have seen that it is impossible to interpret Paul's ministry apart from the eschatological perspective in which

¹ J. Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, M.N.T.C., p. 125. Cf. also O. Cullmann, C.E., p. 238, and H. Weinel, St. Paul, The Man and His Work, trans. G.A. Bienemann, pp. 77f. This is not to say that there is no gradual developing of apostolic consciousness and mission strategy within Paul, but only demands that the origin of this development be traced to Damascus.

it is framed.

Cullmann's brilliant exegesis of II Th. 2.6,7 represents Paul inserting a new element into the speculations of apocalyptic Judaism over the precursors of the Messianic era. Within early Christianity it is the preaching of the gospel which must precede the End¹ and for Paul more specifically the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles.² Applied to II Th. 2.6,7, τὸ κατέχον "that which retards," vs. 6, the final revelation of the Anti-Christ and the coming of Messiah, vs. 8, is the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles, and ὁ κατέχων "the one who retards," vs. 7, is the person commissioned with this special preaching task, Paul himself.³

Cullmann finds support for this bold interpretation in Ro. 9-11. The same necessity of preaching to the Gentiles is designated not only as the precursor of the Messianic era but also as the vehicle for the future salvation of the Jews. This eschatological role of the Gentiles is a μυστήριον personally revealed to Paul, Ro. 11.13,25, and it coincides with his apostolic vocation.⁴ Also in Col. 1.22-29 and Eph. 3.6 we find this same narrow connection between Paul's personal ministry and the divine purpose. "St. Paul knows himself as the instrument, not

1 O. Cullmann, C.E., p. 217.

2. Ibid., p. 218.

3 Ibid., p. 220 Cullmann gives to κατέχω this temporal sense "to retard" in passages of chronological orientation like II Th. 2.6,7 while still maintaining the usual rendering, "to retain", p. 212.

4 Ibid., pp. 238, 239.

only of God, but further of an eschatological plan wholly and concretely fixed by God: First, the gospel is to be preached to the Gentiles."¹ It is this eschatological perspective which explains the urgency and haste of Paul's mission and gives to his apostolic consciousness an intensity and precision that is unique in early Christianity.²

Fridrichsen, pursuing a similar line, interprets Paul's vocational consciousness with reference to two characteristics dominating the eschatological thought of Jewish apocalyptic: (1) The events of the final era which lead to the new, eternal aeon follow each other according to a fixed plan. (2) "Secondly this predetermined series of eschatological events is bound up with certain elected persons who have a distinct and particular place in God's plan of salvation, and who have been given to play a strictly defined role in the great final drama, a role to which they, and they alone, are called - and for which they are specially equipped."³ When Paul introduces himself as a κλητὸς ἀποστολὸς, Ro. 1.1, he is designating himself as an eschatological person of this nature.⁴ "He regards his vocation and task, his person and total existence as main factors in that which has to happen before the Lord would return."⁵

1 Ibid., p. 239.

2 Ibid., pp. 240, 241, 244. Cf. also O. Cullmann, "Eschatology and Missions in the New Testament," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, ed. W.D. Davies and D. Daube, pp. 409-418.

3 A. Fridrichsen, A.M., p. 4.

4 Ibid., p. 3.

5 Ibid., p. 4.

Munck, who has rightly seen Paul's conversion as a summons to bear a prophetic relation to the purpose of God in history, questions whether such an interpretation can be sustained in the light of the Apostle's vocational consciousness. He finds affirmative support in Cullmann's exegesis of II Th. 2.6,7 which he summarizes and completely accepts.¹ He is also in accord with Cullmann's view of Ro. 9-11, though he says that Cullmann has only taken a "stepmother's" interest in the passage. Here Munck sees "The Fullness of the Gentiles" as the content and goal of Paul's mission, Ro. 11.13,25, and this *πλήρωμα* opens the way for the conversion of the Jews and the parousia of Christ.² In Ro. 15.14 Paul is represented as having fulfilled God's eschatological plan in the East and now he looks westward anticipating the completion of his mission in the *πλήρωμα*.³ The decisive significance of Paul's work on the plane of God's historic purpose of salvation warrants his consciousness of possessing a ministry which is superior to that of Moses, II Cor. 3.7,8.⁴ Finally, the two-fold nature of God's eschatological plan is seen in Gal. 2.7,8 in Peter's commission to the Jews and Paul's to the Gentiles.⁵

1 J. Munck, P.H., pp. 28-34.

2 Ibid., pp. 34-41; also J. Munck, C.I., pp. 91f, 99.

3 J. Munck, P.H., pp. 41-48.

4 Ibid., pp. 50-53.

5 Ibid., pp. 53-56. Munck also finds Paul's eschatological mission reflected in Rv. 11.3-13 and Acts 20. 17-38 which, like the conversion accounts, he traces to an early Christian view of Paul's ministry originating with the Apostle himself, pp. 56,57.

In their discovery of the decisive significance of the eschatological for interpreting Paul's vocational consciousness, Cullmann, Fridrichsen, and Munck have perhaps overstated their case. Paul is seen exclusively as the agent of an eschatological plan. However this interpretation does not give sufficient attention to Paul's own emphasis in describing his vocation. He does not derive the methods, strategy, and course of his mission from his insight into an eschatological scheme but from the particular assignment which he receives from Christ. Therefore he does not fulfill an eschatology as such. It would be more accurate to say that he fulfills a commission which he connects (but does not equate) with an eschatological frame of reference. Nevertheless these three scholars have taught us to see that Paul does not conceive of this commission apart from his understanding of God's program of salvation in the last days.

V

Paul, The Steward of the Mysteries of God

This eschatological interpretation which sees Paul's ministry as the self-conscious fulfilling of a divine commission receives strong support from the Epistles. The Apostle expresses this aspect of his vocation in several ways: κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, I Cor. 3.10; κατὰ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἣν ὁ κύριος ἔδωκεν μοι, II Cor. 13.10; καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς Θεός, II Cor. 1.21. However the

terms which are most frequent and definitive in the context of Paul's apostolic mission are ὁ οἰκονόμος and ἡ οἰκονομία. The fact that these words refer to a precisely formulated concept of Paul's mission and do not appear in the allusions to his conversion, Gal. 1.15,16; I Cor. 15.8-11; Phil. 3.12, suggests that they represent an advanced stage of his apostolic consciousness. The divine direction given at Damascus, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Gal. 1.16, has produced upon subsequent reflection a fully developed vocational perspective.¹

In I Cor. 4.1 Paul asks that he, Apollos, and Cephas (3.22) be regarded as servants of Christ, διακόντες Χριστοῦ, and stewards of the mysteries of God, καὶ οἰκονόμοι μυστηρίων Θεοῦ. Several explanations have been given for Paul's use of οἰκονόμος. Reumann has found references to οἰκονόμοι in papyrus fragments and ostraka of the Sarapis and Hermes-Trismegistus cults and concludes that this Pauline designation has its background in a term with religious connotations common in Greco-Roman life.²

1 G.J. Inglis, "The Problem of St. Paul's Conversion," E.T., p. 230. W.M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, p. 85 states, "But the full implication of the Apostolate to the Gentiles was not even by Paul himself realised for many years." However, the use of οἰκονομία in Eph. 3. 1-13, where the Damascus experience is almost certainly in the background of Paul's thought (Cf. above, p. 32, nt. 2) justifies our tracing the commission to the revelation at the time of the conversion, ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, Eph. 3.3, rather than to a subsequent miraculous disclosure. Therefore at Damascus there is a call given, καλέσας, Gal. 1.15, which develops in Paul's thought into a consciousness of having received a divine commission, οἰκονομίαν, I Cor. 9.17. (Cf. above, p. 33, nt. 1).

2 J. Reumann, "Stewards of God - Pre-Christian Religious Application of οἰκονόμος in Greek," J.B.L., LXXVII (1958), 339-349.

However, these *οἰκονόμοι* are not directly involved with religious dispensations like the cultic priests but are only temporary appointments concerned with administrative and business details within the cult, *οἱ πρὸς τοῖς χειρισμοῖς τεταγμένοι*.¹ The parallel to the apostles who are permanently appointed to proclaim the divine word is therefore somewhat strained.

We must also reject the attempt of Windisch, who sees Paul, the *οἰκονόμος μυστηρίων Θεοῦ*, as a hierophant promoting a mystery religion through the initiatory rite of Baptism and the communion with deity in the Lord's Supper.² For it is the administrative official rather than the hierophant who is designated *οἰκονόμος* within the mystery cult.³ Furthermore, the expression is used by Paul in the context of the Gentile mission to refer to an open and public proclamation of God's salvation for all, Eph. 3.1-13, esp. vs. 8; Col. 1.25-29.⁴

1 In the papyrus fragments referred to by Reumann, these *οἰκονόμοι* are mainly concerned with administering the government's allotment of bread to the cult. It is by no means sure that they are officials of the cult itself rather than appointees of the government responsible to the cult. At any rate, *οἱ πρὸς τοῖς χειρισμοῖς τεταγμένοι*, are clearly distinguished throughout from the two cultic priestesses called *αἱ δίδυμαί*, Papyrus, 42, 56 (U. Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemaerzeit*, I, 246f., 280f.).

2 H. Windisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 221f., 225, 226.

3 U. Wilcken, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

4 A Richardson, *op. cit.*, p. 59 states, "The mystery about which St. Paul writes is not a secret *gnosis* magically conferring immortality upon the few: it is the hidden plan of salvation for the whole world, Jew and Gentile alike, which had been kept hidden through all the ages until now, when in these last times it has been disclosed in Jesus Christ and is now proclaimed by those who preach him - i.e. the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God (I Cor. 4.1) - and it stands an open secret, for all who will believe the good news." This close connection between the mystery and Paul's preaching has also been seen by H.A.A. Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions*, p. 128. Also Paul's

The most probable explanation is that Paul's use of *οἰκονόμος* and *οἰκονομία* goes back to Christ himself,¹ who is expressing a relationship with words from the common vocabulary of governmental, military, business, and domestic administration.² There is thus an obvious parallel between the picture which Paul frames in I Cor. 4.1-5 and the parables of Christ in Lk. 12.41-48; 16.1-13:

(1) The steward is entrusted with the master's goods during an interim period marked by the master's absence and the expectation of his return, Lk. 12.42,43, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ...;...ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὕρηται ποιοῦντά οὕτως; Lk. 16.5;³ I Cor 4.5, ὥστε μὴ πρὸ καιροῦ τι κρίνετε, ἕως ἄν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος.

Christianity as a constantly renewed experience is sharply distinguished from the initiatory rite characteristic of the mystery cults by A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. W. Montgomery, pp. 16f. Cf. M. Dibelius, G. Kummel, Paul, pp. 104f.

1 O. Michel, "οἰκοδομέω," T.W.N.T., V, 153 says that Paul is not only influenced by Synoptic tradition but by the use of these words in the early Christian preaching. This is supported by J.B. Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, p. 319, who traces the idea of God as οἰκοδεσπότης, the church as οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ, believers as οἱ κεῖνοι τοῦ θεοῦ, ministers as οἰκονόμοι, and the plan of administration as an οἰκονομία throughout the New Testament.

2 J.H. Moulton, G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, pp. 442,443; also H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, op. cit., II, 1204. The fact that the cynic preacher is compared to an οἰκονόμος in Epictetus, Discourses, III, 22 (Loeb, pp. 132, 133) is evidence of the currency of the expression. Cf. J. Weiss, Der Erste Korintherbrief, p. 93, note 3.

3 Here, though the master has not departed committing his household to the steward, the steward nevertheless acts in the absence of his master and in the master's interest.

(2) In this period the master expects the steward above all to act in faith,¹ Lk. 12.42, τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος; Lk. 16. 10-12, ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῇ πιστὸς ἐστίν; I Cor. 4.2, ὥδε λοιπὸν ζητεῖται² ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις ἵνα πιστὸς τις εὑρεθῇ.³ (3) The master's coming requires the steward to account for his action during the interim period and he is judged and rewarded by the master accordingly, Lk. 12.46-48; 16.2, ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον τῆς οἰκονομίας σου;⁴ I Cor. 4.4-6, ὁ ἐξ ἀνακρίνων με κριτὸς ἐστίν.

In I Cor. 4.1 the οἰκονομία, the "management," "administration" or "plan"⁵ entrusted to Paul, the οἰκονόμος, is expressed as the μυστήριον θεοῦ. Furthermore, in four instances in the

1 The idea of a servant acting in faith within the οἶκος is not new with Christ, but is used of Moses in Num. 12.7, Οὐκ οὕτως ὁ θεράπων μου Μωϋσῆς, ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστὸς ἐστίν, LXX. The distinctive contribution of Christ is to give the metaphor an eschatological perspective by emphasizing the decisive significance of the master's coming. In Hb. 3.1-6, which O. Michel, *op. cit.*, p. 128, has rightly designated a Christian Midrash on Num. 12.7, this eschatological idea is conveyed by the δόξα which is received following the period of service in the οἶκος.

2 The imperative form ζητεῖτε, P,⁴⁶ S (excepting B), D, G, etc. is probably the original and the addition of τί by N and the substitution of the passive form ζητεῖται, B, R were attempts to smoothen the connection with the locative ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις and the 3rd pers. sing. aor. subj. pass. εὑρεθῇ.

3 Paul's consciousness of having received the gospel as a trust, I Th. 2.4, ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; Gal. 2.7, ὅτι πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον parallels the concept of the steward acting in faith.

4 Here, the accounting of the steward precedes the action described by the parable, but is nevertheless synonymous with the master's coming. In vs. 8, the master's second appearance involves a new evaluation of the steward's work.

5 W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 562.

Epistles, *οἰκονομία* actually appears in the closest connection with *μυστήριον*, emphasizing in Eph. 1.9,10 and 3.8,9 the plan (*οἰκονομία*) as a divine possession hidden with God through the ages and in Col. 1.25,26 and Eph. 3.1-3 the plan as now revealed in Paul's ministry.¹ The origin of this vein of Paul's thought has been located in apocalyptic Judaism.² Concerning the use of *μυστήριον* with words denoting revelation in the Jewish apocalyptic, Professor Barr writes, "The contribution of this class of literature is to heighten the sense of deep mystery which has to be broken through, and on the other hand to discern a movement through a number of historical epochs to a culmination, 'in the latter days'."³

Thus Paul is utilizing this apocalyptic mode of expression when he pictures the *μυστήριον* as (1) once hidden, *ὁ ἑτέρας γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη*, Eph. 3.5; *ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν τῷ θεῷ*, Eph. 3.9; *τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν*, Col. 1.26; (2) but now revealed *γνωρίσας ἡμῖν*, Eph. 1.9; *ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον*,

1 E. Lohmeyer, *Der Brief an die Kolosser*, p. 79 has recognized this dual aspect of *οἰκονομία*.

2 O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, trans. F.V. Filson, pp. 156f., 223f.; E. Dinkler, "Earliest Christianity," *The Idea of History in the Ancient Near East*, ed. R.C. Dentan, p. 189; J.A. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 236

3 J. Barr, "Revelation," (Article to be published), p. 5. Cf. Da. 2.18,19,27,29,47; I Enoch 9.6 (A.P., II, 193), though in Enoch *μυστήριον* is not so strongly meshed in an historical chronological framework. For *μυστήριον* used of divine secrets, cf. Eccl. 3.18; Wsd. 2.22. In Wsd. 6.22 the *μυστήριον* of God is able to be traced out from the beginning of creation.

Eph. 3.3; ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη, Eph. 3.5; νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη, Col. 1.26; (3) in this present period which marks the culmination of the ages of history (Note the usage of γενεά, αἰών, and νῦν above.)

εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, Eph. 1.10.

Any attempt to trace a connection with the mystery cults is negated by the fact that Paul publically proclaims the content of the μυστήριον; ¹ it is the free share of the Gentiles in Christ through the gospel, Eph. 3.6; Col. 1.27.² and as Munck has emphasized, the ultimate salvation of the Jews upon the fulfillment of the Gentile mission.³ C.H. Dodd has thus expressed the full significance which Paul attached to μυστήριον when he writes, "...the historic drama of Christ's death and resurrection had brought into clear light the hidden purposes of God by uniting faithful men out of all nations and classes in one firm commonwealth, free and powerful to do the will of God."⁴

1 E.F. Scott, The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians, M.N.T.C., pp. 32f. W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, pp. 183f., 227f.

2. C.L. Mitton, "E.J. Goodspeed's Theory Regarding the Origin of Ephesians," Expository Times, LX (1948,49), 320f. sees in the identification of the μυστήριον with Christ, Col. 1.27, a "new and remarkable development from Paul's earlier uses," which is not found in the instances of μυστήριον in Ephesians, therefore casting suspicion on the Pauline authorship of this epistle. This position is untenable however, in the light of Eph. 3.1-6 (1) where Christ is made synonymous with the μυστήριον, ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, vs. 4; ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, vs. 6; Cf. J.B. Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, pp. 319f.; J.A. Robinson, op. cit., p. 238, and (2) where the identification of the mystery by the three alliterate adjectives συγκληρονόμα, σόσωμα and συμμετοχα, vs. 6, forms with Ro. 6.3-8; Gal. 2.20; Col. 2.12 etc. one of the most characteristic and complete expressions of Paul's "in Christ" theology in the Epistles, J.A.T. Robinson, The Body, p. 63; E. Haupt, Die Gefangenschaftsbriege, pp. 107f.

3 J. Munck, C.I., p. 99; also H.A.A. Kennedy, op. cit., pp. 124, 125; Cf. μυστήριον in Ro. 11.25.

4 C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, p. 39.

This frequent combination of οἰκονόμος, οἰκονομία and μυστήριον by which Paul refers to his apostolic ministry therefore fits the eschatological perspective which Cullmann, Fridrichsen, and Munck have emphasized. In οἰκονόμος, οἰκονομία we have the picture originating in the parables of Christ of a responsibility entrusted to a chosen servant for a period which is terminated by the master's coming. Out of his own vocational consciousness, Paul has characterized this entrusted responsibility as a μυστήριον, namely the salvation of God hidden through the ages and suddenly manifest in the incorporating of Gentiles (and ultimately of Jews) into Christ through the proclamation of the Gospel. Paul, the οἰκονόμος μυστηρίων Θεοῦ, I Cor. 4.1, is thus a person chosen to effect the salvation of God by mission preaching in the time before the parousia.

VI

Paul, the Skilled Masterbuilder

οἰκονόμος is not the only term, however, which is used by Paul in the context of his apostolic vocation. In I Cor. 3.10 he refers to himself as a "skilled master builder" laying a foundation, ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκε. This expression has a close connection to οἰκονόμος because it presupposes the same picture of the church as an οἶκος.¹ That this idea of foundation construction is also basic to Paul's apostolic consciousness is

¹ Cf. οἰκοδομή used of the Corinthian community in vs. 9. Cf. above, p. 40, nt. 1. H. Lietzmann, Korinther I, II, p. 16 says that this οἶκος picture was certainly familiar to the churches at this time.

evident from *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι*, "According to the commission¹ of God given to me...I laid a foundation," vs. 10. The thought is not, as Schlatter states, Paul's inability to finish a job which can only be completed at the *parousia*,² but rather the conviction that his personal apostolic commission is restricted by God to the initial grounding of Christian communities.³

Thus, in II Cor. 10.8; 13.10, Paul speaks of a divine authority which he has received for building the community, *τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἣν ὁ κύριος ἔδωκεν μοι εἰς οἰκοδομὴν*, and in Ro. 15.20 of a determination not to construct upon groundwork of others but to engage strictly in a pioneer mission, *οὕτως δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον εὐαγγελίζεσθαι οὐκ ὅπου ὀνομάσθη Χριστός, ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ*; Cf. also II Cor. 10.16; 12.19. When Paul refers to himself as a *σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων*, I Cor. 3.10, he is therefore claiming a unique relationship to the Corinthian community by virtue of this particular constraint put upon him by apostolic commission to concern himself only with the laying of a foundation.⁴

1 J. Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 40 states, "Commission is literally 'grace' (as in Ro. 12.3), in its derived sense of the divine power which accounted for the genuine results of the mission."

2 A. Schlatter, *Paulus, der Bote Jesu*, p. 132.

3 G. Sass, *Apostelamt und Kirche*, p. 53; also J. Weiss, *Erster Korintherbrief*, p. 79.

4 J. Munck, *P.H.*, pp. 143f. joins the picture of Paul the *σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων* with Paul, the planter, *ἐγὼ ἐφύτευσα*, I Cor. 3.6, claiming that the Apostle's intention throughout is not to contrast himself to others who continued the work, but to emphasize the equality of all Christian leaders in view of God's coming judgement. Though this is surely the point of vs. 5-9, *Θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν*

It is this aspect of Paul's vocational consciousness which explains his financial policy. His concern to make the gospel free of charge, I Cor. 9.18, thus forfeiting his apostolic right to support, II Th. 3.9; I Cor. 9.3-14, is not prompted so much by a desire to avoid scandal as Moffatt¹ and Dibelius-Kummel² have suggested. Actually in the Greco-Roman world, Paul might run the risk of scandal by not accepting remuneration,³ and could easily provoke contempt by supporting himself through manual labour.⁴ Neither can we subscribe to Plummer's position that Paul refused maintenance to avoid becoming obligated to the

οὐκ ἐργάζομαι, we must agree with Lietzmann, Korinther I, II, pp. 15,16, and G. Sass, op. cit., pp. 53f., that there is a decided break in both the metaphor and application at the close of vs. 9. Every minister is engaged in God's work and stands under divine judgement, but the special commission of Paul distinguishes him from them all. The foundation of Christ which he has chosen to lay can neither be replaced nor duplicated, vs. 11, cf. P. Bonnard, "Build," Vocabulary of the Bible, ed. J.J. Von Allmen, trans. comm., p. 44. The true parallel to σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων is therefore that of the father, tutors, and children, I Cor. 4.14-16, for it too emphasizes Paul's unique place as founder of the community, εἰς τὸν γὰρ μὴντορος παιδαγωγὸς ἔχητε ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀλλ' οὐ πολλοὺς πατέρας· ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα. Cf. J. Weiss, Erste Korintherbrief, p. 79.

1 J. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 118.

2 M. Dibelius, W.G. Kummel, Paul, p. 88.

3 O. Schulthess, "σοφός" Paulys Real-Encyclopädie, ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, XV, 2083, states that an honorarium was ordinarily given to doctors, Sophists, philosophers, orators, teachers, poets and actors. Both Plato, Apology, 20 (Loeb, p. 76); Gorgias, 520 (Loeb, p. 510); and Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics, IX 1.5-7, (Loeb, p. 520) thought that payment ought to be made to those who impart knowledge. For them the amount generally corresponds to the value of the instruction given. "Perhaps however the Sophists are bound to demand their fees in advance since nobody would pay money for the knowledge they possess.", Aristotle, loc. cit., Although it is evident that this principle was grossly abused, Xenophon, Memorabilia, I, 6.1-6 (Loeb, p. 69); Epictetus, Discourses, III, 22.47-50 (Loeb, p. 131f.), only Socrates seems to have refused support altogether and is therefore somewhat suspect, Xenophon, loc. cit.

4 Aristotle, Politics, III, 2.8; 3.2,3 (Loeb, p. 190, 196) considered manual labour the task of the slaves, "...since a person living a life of manual toil or as a hired labourer cannot practice the pursuits in which goodness is exercised."

thinking and desires of his communities.¹ This view would not sufficiently justify his acceptance of money from the Philippian church, Phil. 4.14-18.

The explanation is rather that Paul refuses support in order to dramatize the divine origin of his commission. He has been compelled by God to confine his mission to the laying of a foundation, I Cor. 3.10. Therefore, during the period when Paul works to ground the community in Jesus Christ, he will not accept payment from men, because he is fulfilling the will of God.²

In receiving money from Philippi, Paul is not as Deissmann says, making an exception to the rule because of his particular regard for this church.³ He can consistently accept their help because he is confident that a sure foundation has already been laid in Philippi and therefore his commission has been fulfilled in Macedonia, Phil. 1.5; 2.12; 3.16. This church now enters into partnership with him, οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς μόνοι, Phil. 4.15, in the further mission of grounding the church at Thessalonica and Corinth. Their position is exactly that of the church in Rome, where a foundation has also been firmly laid (though not by Paul, Ro. 1.8-15). Thus Paul can conscientiously petition the support of the Roman Christians for the fulfillment of his commission in the West,

1 A. Plummer, Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, I.C.C., p. 305.

2 H.D. Wendland, op. cit., p. 66.

3 A. Deissmann, Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. W.E. Wilson, p. 237. Paul denies Deissmann's principle of evaluation when he expressly assures the Corinthians that it is not for lack of love that he has refused their support, διὰ τί; ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαπῶ ὑμᾶς; ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν, II Cor. 11.11.

Ro. 15.24.¹

In Corinth and Ephesus the situation is quite different. Here, Paul is not sure of the foundations he has begun until after an intense struggle with opposing forces, II Cor. 1.8-11; 2.1-4; 10 - 13; Acts 18.1-18; 19.8 - 20.3, which demands his time and energy almost completely during his second and third missionary journeys, II Cor. 13.1; Acts 18.11; 19.10; 20.1-3. Accordingly, for the entire duration of this period of painstaking construction, any offer of personal maintenance in these two communities is vehemently rejected, II Cor. 10.15,16; 11.7-11; Acts 20.33,34. Paul's acceptance and refusal of support is thereby consistent with his consciousness of being appointed by God for pioneer work in the apostolic mission.²

This relation between Paul's commission and financial policy reaches its clearest expression in I Cor. 9.15-18. The Apostle first establishes the principle that ministers of the gospel are entitled to remuneration. It is a principle which is supported by (1) the example of his colleagues, vs. 4-6, (2) illustrations from everyday life, vs. 7, (3) Scriptural

1 "Paul is hinting that he would like the church of Rome to take some responsibility for his Spanish mission, so that he can start work in the west with their moral support at least, and possibly with some contribution from them in assistants or funds." C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, M.N.T.C., p. 229. Cf. I Cor. 16.6; II Cor. 1.16; Tit. 3.13; Acts 15.3; III Jn. 6; J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, 359, 360; J. Munck, P.H., p. 293.

2 G.S. Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, pp. 264ff. has seen and developed this close connection between Paul's vocation and his principle with regard to maintenance, "Behind this principle we may trace the apostle's high conception of the missionary vocation:...", p. 265.

arguments, vs. 8-12, (4) the parallel to the Temple priests, vs. 13, (5) and finally an express commandment of Christ himself, vs. 14, cf. Mt. 10.10; Lk. 10.7. Notwithstanding the weight of such evidence, Paul has denied himself this apostolic right because he derives a personal satisfaction¹ in not claiming payment for what he is compelled to do by God, οὐδὲ γὰρ μοι ἐστὶν ἔδον μὴ εὐαγγελίσασθαι, vs. 16. A paraphrase of vs. 17 within this context could then be, "If I preach the gospel willingly (ἐκὼν), I am entitled to a reward in accordance with the established principle that the minister should be supported from his ministry. But if I preach the gospel by constraint (ἄκων),² while denying myself this apostolic right, then it is evident that I am fulfilling a commission (οἰκονομίαν)."³

1 The commentators have rightly identified Paul's καθήκον vs. 15,16, with his μισθός in vs. 18. To make the gospel free of charge is both his boast and reward, J. Moffatt, *op. cit.*, p. 121; P.W. Schmiedel, *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, p. 143, etc.

2 A. Schlatter, *op. cit.*, p. 276 rightly observes that ἄκων in this context cannot mean "against Paul's will", for this would contradict the spirit of his mission, but "apart from his choice, without the possibility of his own will becoming prominent."

3 In vs. 17 Paul employs two Simple Conditions, a construction where "the protasis simply states a supposition which refers to a particular case in the present or past implying nothing as to its fulfillment," E.D. Burton, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek, p. 102. The fact of fulfillment does not lie in the conditional sentence, which in itself is wholly colorless, but in the context, *Ibid.*, p. 102, 103. Thus, the ἀνάγκη which Paul mentions in vs. 16 determines the unreality of the first protasis (ἐκὼν) and the reality of the second (ἄκων). Therefore we cannot say with A. Robertson, A. Plummer, First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, I.C.C., p. 189 that both alternatives of vs. 17 are true. The first alternative describes the usual way of preaching the gospel,

When Cullmann says that Paul's ministry coincides with the divine purpose that the gospel must be announced to the Gentiles before the parousia,¹ he has expressed a true aspect of Paul's vocation; but when he states that the "terrible urgency" of this task is reflected in I Cor. 9.16,17² he has separated these verses from their context. Paul is not referring here to the urgency of an eschatological plan but is telling the Corinthians that he does not take remuneration for his preaching in view of the necessity put upon him to fulfil a commission. His financial practice with Philippi and Rome demonstrates, however, that Paul by commission refers here to his own unique task of laying a foundation, I Cor. 3.10. For it is this particular aspect of his commission which becomes evident in his refusal of support. Arranged in a syllogism, the three ideas which form the background of I Cor. 9.16,17 are: (1) Paul has a commission to lay church foundations. (2) Paul will not accept payment while fulfilling a commission. (3) Therefore, Paul will not accept payment while laying a foundation.

This point is important because Cullmann, as well as Munck and Fridrichsen, tends to explain Paul's urgency and constraint exclusively from the Apostle's insight into a divine plan and from the perception of his decisive role in bringing this plan to fulfillment. Paul's imperative results from seeing his mission

namely in expectation of remuneration, which, though a true apostolic principle, is not true for Paul. He has relinquished this right and in so doing the constraint imposed upon him by his commission becomes manifest.

1 O. Cullmann, C.E., p. 239.

2 Ibid., p. 240.

as a work of God which climaxes in the parousia. While granting this to a certain extent, we must also affirm that Paul is motivated by the power of a past event, by the grace of God which was manifested in his conversion and which continues as the inward force enabling him to outstrip his colleagues in the apostolic mission, I Cor. 15.8-11.

We must also recognise that Paul, in describing his vocation does not conceive of himself as one who is bringing an eschatological plan to realisation but as one who is carrying out a commission of the risen Christ. I Cor. 3.10,11 and I Cor. 9.15-18 show that it is Paul's understanding of this commission that determines the conduct of his mission. He is to confine himself as a συνδοὺς ἀρχιτέκτων to the laying of church foundations. It is true that the frequent combination of οἰκονομία and μυστήριον reveals the historical-eschatological perspective to which Paul joins his work, and no aspect of his ministry can be separated from his perception of God's plan for the last days. However as he envisions the Day of the Lord he is not driven on by the necessity of fulfilling the leading role in an eschatological drama (Cullmann). Rather the Day of the Lord for Paul is the time when he appears with his communities before God and accounts for the quality of his unique work of grounding churches, I Cor. 3.13-15; II Cor. 4.13, 14; I Th. 2.19; Phil. 2.16.¹ His motivation, his urgency, does not come from a strict identification

1 G. Sass, op. cit., pp. 31f. has recognised this binding relation between apostle and community which continues to the Day of Judgment. Cf. also E. Lohmeyer, Die Briefe an die Philipper, p. 110.



of his vocation with God's plan as such, but from the constraint of a commission which he views as a specialized task within God's total plan.

VII

Paul, the Runner, the Priest, the Prisoner

Straub has called attention to the frequency of pictorial speech in Paul's references to his vocation. "Seemingly the prevalence of pictures seeks to correct misunderstandings and to justify the particular nature of the apostolic call in a time of highly aroused tensions."¹ We have seen the importance of the steward and the architect in Paul's consideration of his task and noted the related illustrations of the planter and the father.² Three other concepts closely connected with Paul's apostolic consciousness are that of the runner, the priest and the prisoner.

In I Cor 9.24-27 Paul uses the terminology of the race and the prizefight. He urges the Corinthian Christian, like an athlete, to strive for the prize and to endure self-imposed

¹ W. Straub, Die Bildersprache des Apostels Paulus, p. 133.

² Cf. above, p. 45, nt. 4.

restrictions in order to gain the victory.¹ At vs. 26 the application is suddenly shifted to Paul's own ministry and the conditioning which he undergoes in fulfilling his task.

Thus in Gal. 2.2 and Phil. 2.16 Paul is a runner (τρέχω); in Acts 20.24² and II Tim 4.7,³ his missionary work is a course (δρόμος); and it is evident that the prize (βραβεῖον) comes with the summons of God, τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, Phil. 3.14, at the completion of the course on the day of Christ, εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ, Phil. 2.16. Vincent is correct in saying that the prize is not to be strictly identified with the divine call but is rather attached to it and involved in it.⁴ The prize is the crown of righteousness, ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος, ² II Tim. 4.8, the full participation in the fellowship and glory of Christ,

1 J. Hering, La Première Épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, p. 76. P. Wendland, Die Urchristlichen Literaturformen, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, I, 357 has traced occurrences in the Stoic diatribe of the parallel between a spiritual struggle and the training of the athlete. Cf. esp. Epictetus, Discourses, III, 15, 2f. (Loeb, pp. 100f.)

2 H.J. Cadbury, "The Speeches in Acts", The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F.J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, Pt. I, V, 412f. states that Paul's Miletus speech, Acts 20.18-35, "shows the nearest approximation to Pauline language" and its envelopment in the "we" passages give it "the best claim to be included in the memoirs of the eyewitness." H. Wendt, op. cit., p. 423, therefore has strong grounds for his view that the speech is a composition of Luke based on "accurate recollections" of the original.

3 P.N. Harrison, The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, pp. 93, 122, cites II Tim. 4.6-22 and Tit. 3.12 as the two sections of the Pastorals where there is the least room for differences of opinion as to their authenticity. Cf. also E.F. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, M.N.T.C., p. XXII.

4 M.R. Vincent, op. cit., p. 110.

5 Cf. στέφανον, I Cor. 9.25.

Ro. 8.17, which Paul sees as the goal of the divine call, I Cor. 1.9; I Th. 2.12.

It is significant that the prize is conditioned by the performance on the course.¹ The maximum effort which Paul puts forth in the race is prompted by the fact that the runner can be disqualified, ἀδόκιμος, I Cor. 9.27. Moffatt, who notes the gravity of the condition expressed by ἀδόκιμος in II Cor. 13.5-8, believes that Paul is warning against a failure to satisfy the Lord.² The frequent appearance of the phrase εἰς κενόν with τρέχω, "to run without effect, without reaching one's goal,"³ Gal. 2.2; Phil. 2.16 (twice), also reveals the crucial importance of the runner's exhibition throughout the race for determining the prize.

This indicates that we have here the same eschatological perspective that envelops the οἰκονόμος and the ἀρχιτέκτων. Paul the runner⁴ who is awarded at the end of the race in accordance with his showing on a prescribed course equals Paul

1 B. Weiss, op. cit., p. 267.

2 J. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 128.

3 Arndt, W.F., Gingrich, F.W., op. cit., 429.

4 In II Th. 3.1 this metaphor of the race is applied differently, so that the gospel itself is pictured as the runner, ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου τρέχῃ καὶ δοξάζεται καθὼς καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. The concept of the gospel completing a course corresponds to the Synoptic eschatology, Mk. 13.10; Mt. 24.14, where the parousia is made dependent upon the proclamation of Christ to all nations. O. Cullmann, C.E., pp. 218f.; also E. Dobschutz, Die Thessalonicher Briefe, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, p. 305. That Paul connects his own task to this spread of the gospel is evident from the phrase, τὸ λοιπὸν προσερχεσθε, ἀδελφοί, περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα etc. The thought is thus similar to what is expressed in οἰκονόμος μυστηρίων θεοῦ : Paul's mission is involved in the salvation effected by God through the spread of the gospel in the time before the parousia.

the steward accounting for the fulfillment of his commission upon his master's coming, I Cor. 4.1-5, and Paul the architect whose foundation is tested upon the completion of the building, I Cor. 3.10-15.

This same basic orientation appears again in the picture of Paul as a priest in Ro. 15.15,16, εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη. Through a sacerdotal ministration of the gospel, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ,¹ Paul is preparing for the offering of the Gentiles to God, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος. Munck rightly gives the passage an eschatological context, for it is evident from Phil. 2.16,17 that the προσφορά is presented on the day of the Lord.²

On the other hand, the context of Ro. 15.15,16 forbids us to separate the προσφορά from Paul's past and present activity: (1) Paul is a priest διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, vs. 15, the characteristic formula referring to the divine power which produces his apostolic mission.³ (2) The present participle ἱερουργοῦντα with τὸ εὐαγγέλιον demonstrates that Paul's preaching mission constitutes a priestly service.⁴ (3) Paul's priestly work connects in the context to what has been accomplished,

1 Cf. W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, op. cit., p. 374.

2 J. Munck, P.H., pp. 42,43.

3 Paul is a wise master builder κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, I Cor. 3.10; he is a steward of God's mysteries by virtue of τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι, Eph. 3.2. Cf. also I Cor. 15.10; Gal. 2.9.

4 C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, pp. 226, 227 connects the verse to Ro. 12.1 where Paul urges the Romans to the cultic rite of dedicating themselves as a living sacrifice, θυσίαν ζῶσαν. "In so far as his preaching of the Gospel and his pastoral care for the Gentile churches promote this cult, he is exercising a priestly office."

κατειργάστω Χριστὸς δι' ἑμοῦ, from Jerusalem to Illyricum, vss. 17-19, and what he intends to do, ἐλπίζω γὰρ διαπορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς, in Rome and Spain vss. 22-24. Therefore the basic picture of Paul's mission as a movement culminating in the day of the Lord appears again. The quality of his work now in preparing an offering through the priestly administration of the gospel determines (ἵνα) whether the final presentation of the offering will be pleasing, εὐπρόσδεκτος, to God.

The unique feature of the priest image comes in Phil. 2.16,17 where Paul conceives of his own life poured as a libation over his offering of the Gentiles, Ἀλλὰ εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν.¹ σπένδομαι undoubtedly refers to the potential conclusion of his imprisonment

1 J. Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 119 and M. Vincent, op. cit., pp. 71,72 suppose that the Philippians are the priests and their faith the sacrifice. This view is unacceptable because (1) Paul is clearly the active agent in the sentence, σπένδομαι. With Lightfoot's position we would expect the ὑμῶν to appear with θυσίᾳ or λειτουργίᾳ rather than πίστεως (2) It is not consistent with the usage of the priest metaphor in Ro. 15 where Paul is explicitly the priest who offers. (3) It fails to account for the relationship which Paul maintains with the community until the day of the Lord. Cf. II Cor. 11.2 where Paul looks forward to presenting the community as a pure virgin to Christ, παρθένον ἀγνήν παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ. Therefore with J. Munck, P.H., p. 42, we must designate Paul himself the offering priest. "It is established for Paul that a community is only able to appear before God with the help of its leader and grounder. He is their unique and necessary Priest who brings the offering of the Gentiles to God.", E. Lohmeyer, Der Brief an die Philipper, p. 113.

with martyrdom.¹ This would be a final consecration of the offering which he has been preparing through his work. Into his usual conception of a mission culminating in the parousia and the day of judgement and reward, Paul now inserts the possibility of his death.

Weinel considered that the crucial situation in Ephesus described in II Cor. 1.8-11 first forced Paul to face seriously this prospect of death before the parousia.² Taking up this view, C.H. Dodd sees a diminishing of Paul's imminent expectation of the parousia and an emphasis on a realised eschatology in the Epistles following the Ephesus experience.³ The hope of glory moves to the background of Paul's thought while the riches of Christ can be enjoyed now through "Christ-mysticism."⁴ Against this position, however, it must be said that the later Epistles reveal no change in the basic orientation of Paul's vocation. In Phil. 3.14, Paul runs with his

1 H. Strathmann, "λείτουργεω," T.W.N.T., IV, 234; W. Straub, op. cit., p. 31. The idea of libation poured over an offering would be common in both Jewish and Hellenistic circles, cf. Josephus, Antiquities, III, 233-236 (Loeb, p. 429); Arrian, Anabasis of Alexander, VI, 19.5 (Loeb, p. 162); Tacitus, Annals, XVI, 35 (Loeb, p. 389) records how the blood of the dying Thrasea is referred to as a libation, "'Libamus', inquit, 'Iovi liberatori!'" In the oft-noted case of Seneca it is not his life or blood but the water of his bath which is the libation, Ibid., XV, 64 (Loeb, p. 318). Ignatius refers to his approaching martyrdom as a libation, πλέον (δέ) μοι μή παράσχηθε τοῦ σπονδισθῆναι ἐμοί, To the Romans 2.2 (A.F., p. 120).

2 H. Weinelt, op. cit., pp. 380f.

3 C.H. Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development," The Bulletin of John Rylands Library, XVIII (1934), 27-43.

4 C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, p. 149.

eyes fixed on the prize, and here in Phil. 2.17 where the possibility of martyrdom is envisioned in σπένδομαι, Paul still earnestly awaits the final presentation of his offering on the day of Christ, vs. 16.

Finally in II Tim. 4.6-8 Paul's death is no longer a possibility, but a confirmed reality. The tremendous significance attached to this experience by the Apostle is manifest in the appearance in vss. 6,7 of four of the pictures we have noted. (1) The libation of martyrdom which represents a final consecration of Paul's priestly offering is being realised, Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι. (2) The boxer has completed his fight, τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἡγωνίσamai; (3) the runner has finished the race, τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα; (4) the steward has fulfilled his trust, τὴν κτίσιν τετήρηκα.¹ However, vs. 8 demonstrates that the prospect of death has not altered Paul's consciousness of possessing a commission which is only to be culminated on the day of the Lord, λοιπὸν ἀπόκειται μοι ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος, ὃν ἀποδοῦναι μοι ὁ κύριος ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.² His martyrdom represents the stepping-stone to the realization of the prize towards

¹ The occurrence of this phrase in a series of vocational pictures as well as the emphasis upon faith (Cf. above, pp. 40f.) justifies our connecting the expression to the concept of the steward, I Cor. 4.1-5. Cf. E.F. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 133.

² N.Q. Hamilton, The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, pp. 56-70, has effectively contested Dodd's viewpoint in the light of the futuristic (as well as realized) eschatology of the Epistle to the Romans which of course is subsequent to the Ephesus experience. Cf. also W. Barclay, The Mind of St. Paul, pp. 218-223. M. Werner, The Formation of Christian Dogma, trans. S.G.F. Brandon, pp. 31-33, 71-78, 107-115, 165, 166, 283-285 believes that the delay of the parousia did not so

which his total mission has been directed.¹

Paul's use of the prisoner image is to be distinguished from the pictures that we have noted thus far. It lays emphasis on a particular aspect of his apostolic consciousness, namely the necessity for suffering, rather than embracing the totality of his vocation with its culmination in the parousia. Thus in I Cor. 4.8-11 Paul sarcastically contrasts his own humiliating lot with the Corinthians' premature enjoyment of the riches of God's kingdom.² For the Corinthians, the apostles

much effect a change in Paul's mind but rather was a fundamental theological problem of the post-apostolic church. Whereas Paul saw the death and resurrection of Christ as the first fruits in a series of events culminating in the parousia and the dawn of the Messianic Age, the second generation of Christianity ascribed a symbolic soteriological significance to the crucifixion and resurrection in themselves. This view has serious difficulties. (1) Since Werner assigns every N.T. expression of this later doctrine to the post-apostolic church, his interpretation stands upon a highly questionable critical foundation. (2) He overlooks the fact that the basic redemptive event was not anticipated but proclaimed as having occurred. O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, pp. 81-88. (3) Although the delay in the parousia undoubtedly raised questions, e.g. the status of the dead in Christ, I Th. 4.13-18, it could hardly create changes of the magnitude which Werner's view suggests, for it was the fact of the parousia and not the timing which determined the church's hope for the fulfillment of salvation.

1 P.N. Harrison, op. cit., p. 113 noting the similarity of expression between II Tim. 4.6-8 and Philipians suggests that II Tim. 4 is to be dated shortly after Philipians following the confirmation of Paul's death sentence. However, II Tim. 4 includes four of the vocational images while in Phil. 2.16,17 there are only two (the runner and priest). Also these verses in II Timothy reflect the same eschatological orientation which conditions Paul's references to his mission throughout the Epistles. The alledged parallel between II Tim. 4 and Philipians would therefore appear indecisive for determining the date of this particular section of II Timothy.

2 ἐκλουθήσασθε and ἐβασιλεύσασθε, vs. 8, probably refer to the Stoic boast of possessing spiritual riches and royalty, J. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 49, Rv. 3.17, as well as to the expectation of reigning with Christ presented in the Christian preaching, I Cor. 6.3; Rv. 5.10; 20.4; 22.5; H.D. Wendland, op. cit., p. 34.

have been glorified as teachers of wisdom, I Cor. 1.17; 2.1,13,¹ but for Paul they are like men under the death sentence, forced to fight wild beasts in the final event at the arena, δοκῶ γάρ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐσχάτους ἀπέδειξεν ὡς ἐπιθανατίους, ὅτι θεάτρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις.² The concept of a struggle before divine and human witnesses was common to both Jewish,³ and Greek⁴ literature.

In this usage the distinctive element is that Paul attributes his situation to an act of God. His suffering results from a binding union with the message that God has commanded him to preach, from a full identification with Christ crucified. This is evident from the characteristics of the prisoner which Paul

1 J. Munck, P.H., pp. 127-132, 147-161. has contributed much to the exegesis of I and II Corinthians by separating the divisions at Corinth from basic party lines within early Christianity and attributing them to dissensions arising out of the Corinthian misunderstanding of the (1) gospel, (2) the apostles, and (3) their new position in Christ.

2 G. Sass, op. cit., p. 84, interprets ἐσχάτους eschatologically, corresponding to God's setting the apostles in the time before the parousia; J. Weiss, Erster Korintherbrief, pp. 108, 109 refers it to the humble status which the apostles assume now in contrast to their office in the Messianic Kingdom, Mt. 19.28f. However, the great majority take ἐσχάτους, ἀπέδειξεν, ἐπιθανατίους, θεάτρον, as the key words which form the picture of the gladiator fighting at the end of the exhibition in the arena, G. Kittel, "θεάτρον," T.W.N.T., III, 43; W. Straub, op. cit., p. 54; H. Lietzmann, Korinther, I,II, p. 20; J. Moffatt, op. cit., p. 49.

3 Cf. 1 Enoch 9.1; 62.9-13 (A.P., II, 192, 228). G. Kittel, op. cit., p. 43 also notes the suffering of Job, whose plight was evident to spectators in heaven as well as on earth.

4 Seneca, On Providence, 2.7-9, (Loeb, p. 10) in a remarkable parallel, states that the youth countering the charge of the lion is a spectacle worthy of the gods. The picture is then used as an illustration of man's struggle against opposing forces. Cf. Hb. 10.32-34.

enumerates in vs. 10, ἡμεῖς μωροὶ διὰ Χριστόν, ὑμεῖς δὲ φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστῷ. ἡμεῖς ἀσθενεῖς, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰσχυροί. They are the very words used to describe the message of the cross in I Cor. 1.22-25. Here again is the contrast between Paul presenting Christ crucified in foolishness, weakness, and disgrace and the Corinthians receiving Christ as wisdom, strength and honour, I Cor. 1.18 - 2.5.¹ The ordeal of the prisoner is therefore his determination to know only Christ and the cross, I Cor. 2.2; Paul's suffering is a dying with Christ,² I Cor. 15.30,31. The paradox of the prisoner is that the bearing of the offense of Christ is the channel through which the power of God becomes evident,³ I Cor. 2.1-5.

The prisoner image appears again in II Cor. 2.14f. where Paul numbers himself among the captives being led about in God's triumphal procession, Τῷ δὲ Θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. This sense is preferable to designating Paul as a soldier in God's triumph as Ramsay⁴ and Kinsey⁵ have done. In

1 A. Schlatter, op. cit., p. 159. J. Munck, P.H., p. 159 defines the contrast eschatologically: Paul bears the suffering of Christ in the world; the Corinthians deem themselves already raised with Christ in glory.

2 A. Schweitzer, op.cit., pp. 150f.

3 G. Kittel, op. cit., p. 43 states "...; here God is himself the author of the weakness of his Apostle, which thereby, as a divine work becomes power - namely, God's power - so that the spectator is disposed to see something fully different than the actual occurrence taking place in that θέατρον. "

4 W.M. Ramsay, Luke the Physician, p. 297.

5 A.B. Kinsey, "The Triumph Joy," E.T., XXI (1909-10), 282. Kinsey also suggests viewing Paul as an honoured friend in the triumph, loc. cit.

Paul's only other usage of *ἐπαυξέω* in Col. 2.15 it is clearly the vanquished who are led in triumph, *ἐπαυξέουσιν αὐτοὺς* (the principalities and powers) *ἐν αὐτῷ*.¹ Furthermore examples of *ἐπαυξέω* used with reference to those who have been conquered often occur in extra-Biblical Greek.²

However, in regarding Paul as a captive in God's triumph procession,³ we are not required to reject the possibility of Paul's sharing in God's victory.⁴ As Schlatter has said, "But the way in which Paul has spoken of the triumph of God in Christ over the heavenly powers, Col. 2.15, makes it probable that he has placed himself in the company of those who have been vanquished by the victor and now proclaim his victory in that they are numbered with him in his triumphal procession."⁵

1 The fact that God is the subject, vs. 13, and that it is triumph in Christ, *ἐν αὐτῷ*, as in I Cor. 2.14, favors a consistent usage of *ἐπαυξέω* in both verses. W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 364; W. Michaelis, *op. cit.*, II, 312. Cf. Eph. 1.21. However it is possible to take *ὁ Χριστός* as the subject in Col. 2.15 and to render *ἐν αὐτῷ* as *ἐν σταυρῷ*. Cf. the discussion of T.K. Abbott, *Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, I.C.C., pp. 257-263.

2 Plutarch, *Comparison of Theseus and Romulus*, IV, 2 (Loeb, p. 194); *Antony* LXXXIV, 4 (Loeb, p. 324). Cf. also H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, *op. cit.*, I, p. 628.

3 The majority of the commentators take this view, A. Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 68; H.J. Holtzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 360; W. Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 174; Cf. also R.M. Pope, "Studies in Pauline Vocabulary," *E.T.*, XXI (1909,10), 21.

4 H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, p. 97 is therefore unjustified to force the choice between Paul the prisoner in God's triumph and Paul the participant in God's conquest.

5 A. Schlatter, *op. cit.*, p. 495. In Papyrus 1061, 19 of the Aegyptische Urkunden aus Museen zu Berlin, *ἐπαυξέω* has the sense of "proclaim or noise abroad," *πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐκπαυξισθῆναι τὸ πρᾶγμα*, (A.S. Hunt "Lexical Notes from the Papyri", *Expositor*, VII (1909), 473).

Thus, the paradox of the prisoner is even more explicit here than in the image of the gladiator in I Cor. 4.8f. The captive being led about in humiliation and defeat gives evidence of God's conquest and takes an active share in publishing the victory, *καὶ τὴν δομὴν τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ.*¹

The aptness of the prisoner image is revealed by the context. Paul had traveled from Troas to Macedonia and had there undergone intense affliction, 7.5, as well as desperate anxiety over the outcome of events in Corinth, 2.12,13. But finally with the arrival of Titus he learns of a great victory for the gospel in the Corinthian church, 7.6. The picture of God's triumph represents Paul's reaction to this news, *Τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις.*² Through the prisoner's partaking of Christ's suffering, the power of God had again been released in his ministry.

This is the interpretation that Paul gives to his suffering throughout the Epistle, II Cor. 1.6; 6.1-10; 11.23 - 12.10; 13.3,4. Even the bitter experience of his *σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί*, 12.7, is considered a gift, *ἔδωκε μοι*, because it is a weakness through which the power of God is perfected, *ἡ γὰρ δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται*, vs. 9.³ For this reason Paul can boast, *καυχῆσθαι* and be content, *εὐδοκᾶν* in every conceivable hardship, knowing that his strength

1 Plutarch, Comparison of Agesilaus and Pompey III, 2 (Loeb, p. 330) records that Pompey after triumphing over King Tigranes makes him his ally, *καὶ, Τιγρᾶνῃν τὸν Ἀρμενίων βασιλέα γενόμενον ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ θριαμβεῖσθαι σὺμμαχον ἐποίησεν.*

2 H. Lietzmann, Korinther I,II, p. 108; H.D. Wendland, op. cit., p. 152.

3 E. Kaseman, op. cit., p. 54.

lies in weakness, ὅταν γὰρ ἴσθην, τότε δυνατός εἰμι, vs. 10. It is the same paradoxical view that pervades his letters, Ro. 8.36,37; Phil. 1.12; Col. 1.24; Eph. 3.1,13. Thus we find ourselves at the very core of Paul's apostolic consciousness in II Cor. 4.11, where the Apostle sees his life as a continuous dying with Christ in order to become the channel of Christ's life. For the Corinthians it means that ὁ θάνατος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνεργεῖται, ἡ δὲ ζωὴ ἐν ὑμῖν.

The accent of the prisoner image is therefore upon the significance of Paul's suffering in his present experience.¹ However, the eschatological orientation reflected in the other vocational pictures is not lacking. For as the steward labours for his master's approval, and the runner exerts himself for the prize, so the prisoner awaits his release from suffering and his entrance into eternal glory, II Cor. 4.17; Phil. 1.19-25.² The present time of participation in Christ's death looks to the coming fulfillment of the union in Christ's resurrection, Ro. 6.5; 8.17.

1 Paul's use of δέσμιος as a designation for himself during the imprisonment period reflects the same sense of complete identification with Christ, Eph. 4.1; Phil. 1.9, for the benefit of the community, ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν, Eph. 3.1. In II Tim. 1.8 the paradoxical elements of suffering and power are characteristically combined with his status as a prisoner, μὴ οὖν ἐπαισχυνθῆς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μηδὲ ἐμὲ τὸν δέσμιον αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ συγκακοπάθησον τῇ εὐαγγελίᾳ κατὰ δυνάμιν θεοῦ.

2 Paul's endeavors to persuade the Corinthians to share his burden, II Cor. 1.3-7, again confirm Munck's view that they consider themselves already raised to this glory. Cf. above, p. 61, nt. 1.

VIII

A Summary of Conclusions Reached in Part One

Paul's conversion is an encounter with the risen Christ and through this a sudden insight into God's plan of salvation. As Munck has demonstrated the experience cannot be explained by citing conditioning factors. His analysis of the pre-conversion period casts suspicion on any attempt to give Paul the Jew a positive inclination to Christianity. But beyond the scope of Munck's treatment, the two known facts of the pre-conversion period, Pharisaism and persecution, require us to attribute to Paul a negative disposition toward Christianity. His zeal for the Jewish faith was outraged by the threat of Christianity to the Law and the chosen people, a threat which centered in the claim that Jesus who had suffered and died was God's Messiah. Paul's persecution is thus an attempt to maintain the purity of Judaism in the face of the Christian menace. When the risen Lord comes to him this context of thought and action is radically reversed. At Damascus Paul begins to see a free salvation for the whole world. Furthermore out of this experience grows the compulsion to make Christ his own, not only the power of His resurrection, but also the fellowship of His sufferings, Phil. 3.10.

Munck's work on the O.T. prophetic expressions also favors the acceptance of the Damascus experience as an unconditioned act of God's grace. However the real significance of these expressions extends beyond the support of this view. Although they do not

justify our interpreting Paul as a First Century Jeremiah or Second Isaiah, they do reveal his consciousness of a prophetic relation to the will of God. He believes himself designated by divine $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ as a vehicle for extending God's purpose of salvation to the Gentiles. The conversion accounts, including the prophetic expressions, show that Paul sees Damascus as God's first revelation of this plan. It is also the impressing of the plan upon his life so that neither his conversion nor his ministry can be separated from it. What is given at Damascus is both the ground and goal of all that follows.

The Epistles are the evidence that the sudden insight of Damascus matured in Paul's mind until he had a clear concept of God's plan for the last days and a full understanding of his own assignment within this plan. In accord with the view that the particular character of Paul's vocation is revealed in his pictorial speech,¹ we have examined the images which convey the deepest meaning in passages of heightened apostolic consciousness.² This study has confirmed the assertion of Cullmann,

1 Cf. above, p. 52 .

2 We have treated the occurrence of the steward, the builder, the runner, the priest, and the prisoner, and noted the planter, the father, and the prizefighter. Paul also uses $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\alpha$, $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ to refer to his vocation, but only as a general designation Ro. 11.13; II Cor. 11.23 which can also be used of other ministers (not necessarily apostles), Eph. 6.21; I Th. 3.2, the offering for the Jerusalem church, Ro. 15.31; I Cor. 9.1, 12, 13, indeed of any service for Christ, I Cor. 12.5. For the meaning of $\pi\upsilon\sigma\omicron\beta\epsilon\tau\omicron$, II Cor. 5.20; Eph. 6.20, cf. above, p. 21. The one usage of $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$, I Cor. 4.1 appears to have no particular significance apart from $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$. Note also in II Cor. 10.4 the single occurrence of $\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\alpha$ which conveys a thought similar to the prisoner image.

Munck and Fridrichsen that Paul's ministry is bound up within an eschatological perspective. Indeed this perspective is the obvious feature which joins these vocational images together. All of them focus upon a specific activity in the present, Paul's mission, which is directed toward a distinct goal, the coming of Christ to judge and reward. The steward administers in anticipation of the master's coming; the builder constructs in prospect of a final inspection; the runner trains and races in the hope of winning the prize; the priest prepares an offering which he will at last present. With the prisoner the emphasis lies upon the meaning of the present experience. But his suffering too awaits the End, the day of rest and release. Furthermore we cannot discount a possible eschatological significance in the gladiator's appearance in the final event, and the captives location at the end of the triumphal procession.

Cullmann, Fridrichsen, and Munck are also justified in attaching Paul's vocation to God's purpose in history, to the divine plan of salvation in the last days. As Munck observes, Paul is a "heilsgeschichtliche Gestalt". In Paul's own words, he is an *ὁκονόμος μυστηρίων Θεοῦ*. Through his ministry in the fullness of times, the purpose of God hidden through the ages becomes evident to all men. God's historic plan to save the Gentiles is revealed in Paul's apostolic mission.

On the basis of this study we therefore endorse the eschatological interpretation put forth by these three scholars: Paul is conscious of being divinely called to a mission which he connects ^{with} to what God intends in the time before the End. Nevertheless, it must be recognised that this conclusion has been

reached without alluding to the two references which are the backbone of the eschatological view, namely II Th. 2.6,7 and Ro. 9 - 11. The reason is that these passages as interpreted by Cullmann and Munck go beyond anything we have said. If Paul personally is the one who restrains the final manifestation of the Anti-Christ, and his own mission delays the dawn of the Messianic era, then Paul not only connects and attaches his ministry to God's plan, but moreover identifies it with the divine plan. If Paul is saying in Ro. 9 - 11 that his individual work culminates in "The Fullness of the Gentiles", then he is not merely another person but is, as Munck maintains, the central figure in the Heilsgeschichte. However this bold exegesis of II Th. 2.6,7 and Ro. 9 - 11 has immediate implications for the structure of the apostolate and the exercise of the apostolic mission, which must be examined before we can ascertain whether Paul's self-consciousness reached such heights.

At this point we can only say that the vocational images support a skeptical view of this aspect of the eschatological theory. In the wise master builder we do not have an all-embracing responsibility, but a very specialized task within the church. Paul's financial policy demonstrates how deeply this assignment to a pioneer mission had been impressed upon his consciousness. The orientation of the other pictures also reveals the specific nature of his undertaking. The day of judgement for Paul is not his personal completion of God's plan but the time when "each man's work will become manifest," I Cor. 3.13. The Apostle only accounts for his own job on the foundation;

this is the course which he runs and for which he is rewarded;
this is the offering he is preparing. Therefore, the vocational
images indicate that Paul has a vital share in God's salvation
in the "fullness of time", but the divine activity is not
bound by his mission. Paul's work is identified within God's
plan, but God's plan transcends Paul's work.

PART TWO

PAUL'S APOSTOLATE AND THE APOSTLES OF CHRIST

A Summary of the Views of Fridrichsen, Munck, and Cullmann
on Paul's Apostolate

We have seen that Cullmann, Fridrichsen, and Munck attribute to Paul a self-consciousness which is exceptional in primitive Christianity. He knows himself as the key man in the chain of events leading to the parousia. Such a view obviously has powerful implications for interpreting Paul's relation to the other leaders of the church. Aware of a special call and position in God's redemptive program, Paul would assume a significance and status surpassing the other apostles and even the Twelve. He would be an apostle in a unique sense. These implications are avoided by Cullmann but pursued consistently by both Fridrichsen and Munck.

According to Fridrichsen the term ἀπόστολος is used by Paul to represent his vital role in the final salvation drama. ἀπόστολος designates his lifework to the Gentiles and its significance for preparing the parousia and establishing the eternal aeon.¹ This permanent, eschatological apostolate has its origin in the call and equipping of Peter.² The vestiges of the tradition of Peter's call in John 21 and Matthew 16 seem to indicate an appointment to some form of episcopacy. However it is clear from Gal. 2.7-9 that Paul regards Peter's call to the Jews as a permanent eschatological apostolate with a significance

1 A. Fridrichsen, A.M., pp. 3,4.

2 Ibid., p. 7.

parallel to his own commission to the Gentiles.¹

Paul, in Fridrichsen's view, never refers to the other eleven disciples as apostles. They were chosen to be co-regents in the Millennial Kingdom that Christ expected in Israel. But by presenting the parallel of Gal. 2.7-9, Paul initiates a process which results in the ascribing of a permanent eschatological apostleship to the Twelve. The Acts, Revelation, and Ephesians as well as the Synoptic gospels witness Paul's unique apostolic consciousness passing from Peter to the eleven.²

In his key article on the apostolate, "Paul, the Apostles, and the Twelve," Munck is in full accord with the substance of Fridrichsen's view. When Paul speaks of himself as ἀπόστολος in Ro. 11.13,14; 15.15,16; Gal. 2.7-9 and in the greetings of the Epistles, he is referring to his unique summons to an eschatological mission.³ The mention of Peter in Gal. 2.7-9 represents "the only place where Paul uses the word apostle or apostolate of another, who is pre-eminently called by Christ."⁴

Paul is the first to attach this special significance to ἀπόστολος but he does not originate the term. When he arrives on the Christian scene Paul finds the word already used to designate (1) a messenger and (2) a missionary sent out by Christ. He occasionally employs the first sense in ecclesiastical speech to refer to the messengers of the churches, II Cor. 8.23,

1 Ibid., pp. 6,18.

2 Ibid., pp. 18,19.

3 J. Munck, P.A.T., pp. 96-99.

4 Ibid., p. 108.

Phil. 2.25 but it is the second meaning that is most frequent in Paul. In Ro. 16.7; I Cor. 4.9; 9.1,2; 12.28,29; 15.7-9; II Cor. 11.5,13; 12.11,12; Gal. 1.17-19 and I Th. 2.6 he uses *ἀποστολος* of missionaries sent out by Christ and connects himself to this "already existing" group.¹ When he includes himself within this pre-Pauline definition of *ἀποστολος* he humbly departs from the unique eschatological sense of apostle which he only attributes to himself and Peter. "He does not strive to become an apostle like the others; he has received a special call, and when he discusses his apostleship he makes use of a terminology which is not his own, and he descends to a far lower level than when he himself speaks his mind."²

Paul never applies *ἀποστολος* to the Twelve (except Peter), either in the pre-Pauline meaning of a missionary sent out by Christ, or in accordance with his own unique consciousness of one called to an eschatological mission.³ However in the post-Pauline period the special significance which he attached to *ἀποστολος* by virtue of his unique call becomes the determining factor in a process where the term is still used of missionaries but increasingly, and later exclusively, of the Twelve.⁴

This post-Pauline picture of the Twelve as apostles in

1 *Ibid.*, pp. 103-108; cf. J. Munck, *P.H.*, pp. 206f.

2 J. Munck, *P.A.T.*, p. 101.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 104. In *P.H.*, p. 207, Munck admits an exception in the case of Gal. 1.17-19 where he states that *ἀποστολος* is used of the Twelve but that Paul is here quoting a claim that was made for the Twelve by his Judaistic-Gentile opponents in Galatia.

4 J. Munck, *P.A.T.*, p. 108.

Acts, Ephesians, Revelation, etc., takes two distinct forms. One depicts them as a college resident in Jerusalem which Munck holds as a genuine early tradition. In another later development they have become Pauline type missionaries journeying to the ends of the world. Both these aspects reveal the influence of Paul's ἀπόστολος concept. "When the college, which does not consist of travelling missionaries, is given a name which denotes exactly this, the reason must be that this name has acquired a special implication, a degree of dignity belonging to the highest in the church."¹ ἀπόστολος no longer means missionary; but, by being used by Paul of his special vocation, it comes to denote "one pre-eminently called by Christ" and is applied in this sense to the Twelve. Finally at the conclusion of the process when the Twelve are actually made Gentile apostles of the Pauline-type, we have the complete triumph of Paul's ἀπόστολος idea. Ironically the result is that Paul himself becomes overshadowed in the later Gentile church.²

Cullmann does not distinguish so sharply between the apostolate of Paul and that of the other Christian leaders. Within the early church he finds a wider usage of ἀπόστολος denoting an eye-witness of the resurrection but also a narrower sense where it designates a member of the Twelve, "who must bear witness not only to Christ risen but also to Christ incarnate on earth."³

1 Ibid., p. 109.

2 Ibid., pp. 108-110; cf. also J. Munck, P.H., pp. 206, 207.

3 O. Cullmann, The Early Church, p. 72.

Thus, although the Twelve are distinguished by their association with Jesus, Paul shares their lot in certain important respects. Like all the apostles, he can testify to the resurrection and he has received a commission directly from Christ.¹

Furthermore Cullmann holds that the other apostles like Paul see the significance of their work for the expected parousia. Their mission to the world is located in the interval between Christ's resurrection and return. "The vocation of the other apostles of Christ also has an eschatological character. For with all the disciples who have received the missionary imperative, whether from the historical Jesus or from the risen one, there is a concern to prepare men for the parousia of the one who is to come!"² Though Paul's apostolate does not therefore differ in its essential character, his apostolic consciousness is in stricter agreement with God's eschatological plan and attains a higher degree of intensity and precision than that of the others.³

Cullmann is inclined to give Peter an even greater significance among the church's leaders by virtue of his unique relation to Jesus, his priority as a witness of the resurrection, and his special commission.⁴ Nevertheless, though Peter pre-eminently fulfils the requirements of an apostolate, and Paul

1 Ibid., p. 79; O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, trans. F.V. Filson, pp. 56f., 215f.

2 O. Cullmann, C.E., p. 240.

3 Ibid., pp. 240, 241.

4 O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, pp. 64, 218f.

stands alone in the clarity of his consciousness, Cullmann asserts that, according to the united testimony of the New Testament, the fundamental function to lay the foundation of the church is mutually shared by all the apostles. Gal. 2.9, Eph. 2.20, and Rv. 21.14 are cited as evidence of this equality within the apostolic task.¹

The basic differences between Cullmann on the one hand and Munck and Fridrichsen on the other are immediately apparent: (1) According to Cullmann the apostles have their origin in the appearances of the risen Christ and the reception of his commission, whereas Munck and Fridrichsen see Paul's unique call as the initial point.² (2) Cullmann states that the Twelve from the beginning are apostles in the narrowest sense. For Munck and Fridrichsen only Paul and Peter are apostles in the full significance of the term and the designation is not given to all the Twelve until well after the first generation of Christianity. (3) The allusions to the apostles in the Synoptics, Acts, Ephesians, and Revelation, while accepted by Cullmann as a reliable picture of the early Christian apostolate, are for Munck and Fridrichsen the reflection of this post-apostolic development.

One suspects that these differences are occasioned primarily by a disparity of approach. Fridrichsen and Munck have both looked at the apostolate from their firmly established eschatological interpretation of Paul's vocation. While sharing

1 Ibid., p. 217.

2 Fridrichsen views the call of Peter as the first apostolate but only as it was subsequently interpreted by Paul. Cf. above pp. 70, 71.

this interpretation, Cullmann has not permitted it to become the determining factor but has rather been constrained by other considerations, such as the place of Peter in the leadership of the early church, and the communication of the tradition of Jesus, to take a more moderate view of the apostolate. Therefore from the standpoint of consistency alone the construction of Munck and Fridrichsen has the advantage.

Cullmann must be asked how Paul could regard the apostolate as a ministry that was mutually shared, if he knew himself at the same time as the one personally delegated to the mission that was decisive for the advent of the new aeon? Munck and Fridrichsen are more consistent to represent Paul as an apostle in a unique and exclusive sense. However from the standpoint of accuracy we must conclude that Cullmann's conception of the apostolate more nearly approximates the picture presented by the New Testament and particularly the Epistles of Paul.

II

Paul's Demand for Equality with the Apostles

The decisive argument against the position of Munck and Fridrichsen is the perspective of Paul when he applies ἀπόστολος to himself and others in a connected context. Munck correctly observes that the word is taken from a pre-Pauline terminology. However he is undoubtedly mistaken in his view that, by using

ἀποστολος in these instances, Paul is descending to a lower level and placing himself in a classification where he does not really belong. Precisely the opposite is true. Because his opponents feel that he lacks the qualifications for apostleship, Paul throughout his ministry tends to be deemed somewhat less than an apostle. His claim to full status demands that he ascend from this lower level and frame his evidence so as to secure a position of equality.

This is obvious from I Cor. 15.3-7 where Paul presents the tradition¹ of Christ's resurrection appearances.² In vs. 8 on the basis of the Damascus experience, he boldly adds his own name to the list of official witnesses with the reservation ὅς οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀποστολος, vs. 9. This self-consciousness in including himself is not occasioned as Munck claims by a feeling of superiority which has its origin in Paul's unique eschatological call.³ Rather its cause is clearly expressed

1 Vide. Extended Note 1 at the end of Part Two.

2 R. Bultmann, op. cit., p. 82 estimates that there were two ways of demonstrating the truth of the resurrection within the early church: the testimony of eye witnesses, I Cor. 15.5-7, and agreements discovered in the Old Testament indicated in the phrase, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, I Cor. 15.3,4. In accord with this view we are not to conclude that Paul is giving an exhaustive list of those to whom Christ appeared but only those who were considered officially qualified witnesses. Neither should we suppose that those named were all regarded apostles. K.H. Rengstorff, op. cit., p. 43, says, "It is questionable whether the 'more than five hundred brethren' of I Cor. 15.6, became apostles as a result of the appearance of Jesus, although verses 8f. attest the early Christian linking of apostleship with personal contact with the Risen Lord, and the thought of the founding of the apostolate is very prominent in the whole passage." Cf. also W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 30,177.

3 J. Munck, P.A.T., p. 105.

as the negative position from which Paul entered the Christian faith; because he once persecuted the church, διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, he is not worthy to be called an apostle.

The most explicit indication of this feeling of inferiority is found in τῷ ἑκτρώματι, vs. 8. Karl Holl in his classic article connects ἑκτρώματι with the temporal adverb ἔσχατον and sees here an example of the criticism which Paul endured because of the untimely occasion of his birth into the Christian faith at Damascus. His experience of the resurrection follows long after the termination of the period in which the risen Christ was believed to have manifested himself to the apostles.¹ Though this issue is certainly involved in I Cor. 15.3-8, it is an improbable interpretation of τῷ ἑκτρώματι. In every occurrence of ἑκτρώμα in the extra-Biblical Greek where there is a time factor involved, the thought is not of late but rather early, premature birth.² Accordingly the term is best translated "miscarriage", or "abortion". Joined to the subsequent allusion to Paul's persecution³, it underscores his sudden violent birth into the faith, his total lack of preparation for the ministry, as opposed to the normal gradual development of the other apostles into Christian maturity and leadership.⁴ The

1 K. Holl, "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde," Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, II, 150. Cf. also G.J. Inglis, "St. Paul's Conversion in His Epistles," p. 219.

2 J. Schneider, "ἑκτρώμα," T.W.N.T., II, 463f. Cf. P.P. Goodspeed 15.15 and A.P. 11 in J.H. Moulton, G. Milligan, op. cit. p. 200.

3 Thus the γάρ in vs. 9 is illative introducing the ground or reason for the ἀπεπέρι τῷ ἑκτρώματι of vs. 8.

4 G. Heinrici, Das erste Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Korinther, pp. 480f.; C. C. Weissäcker, op. cit., p. 85; J. Weiss, H. Lietzmann, A. Robertson and A. Plummer ad. hoc.

inclusion of the article τῷ suggests that ἔκτρωμα was used as a term of abuse by Paul's enemies.¹ Its significance would not only serve to discredit his previous record, but also to ridicule the present result of this miscarriage into the Christian apostolate. It is to be noted in this regard that the Jewish uses of ἔκτρωμα place emphasis on the absence of life altogether or else the grotesque corruption of normal development that results from the premature birth.²

Furthermore Paul's consciousness of an inferiority among

1 W.M. Macgregor, Christian Freedom, p. 30; B. Weiss, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 352. Cf. also C.F.D. Moule, An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek, p. 111. E. Käsemann, op. cit., pp. 35f has found several instances in the Corinthian correspondence where words probably used in accusations against Paul are employed for his own purposes, i.e. ἀσθένεια, II Cor. 10.10; 11.21, 29, 30; 12.9.10; σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, I Cor. 1.22; II Cor. 12.12; μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος, II Cor. 10.12f.; δοκιμή, II Cor. 13.3-6; ἱκανός, II Cor. 2.17-36. Cf. above, p. 60, 61.

2 ἔκτρωμα appears three times in the LXX, once representing נֶמֶן in Nu. 12.12 and twice שֶׁבִי in Job 3.16 and Eccl. 6.3. In each case the analogy to a premature child born dead is employed. Philo, Allegorical Interpretation I, 76 (Loeb, Philo I), p. 196 allegorizing upon Nu. 12.12, refers to the products of a foolish mind as ἀβλαβήρια εὐρίσκειται καὶ ἔκτρωματι, "wretched abortions and miscarriages."

In a thorough analysis of the usage of ἔκτρωμα, J. Munck, "Paulus Tanquam Abortivus, I Cor. 15.58," New Testament Essays, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, pp. 180-193 admits this O.T. analogy as one possibility for interpreting I Cor 15.8. Paul as a former persecutor of the church, vs. 9, compares himself to the wretchedness of the stillborn child. Though this is a legitimate explanation in itself, it seems that Munck has not considered the significance of the term in the context of this list of witnesses to the resurrection. Specifically he has not accepted τῷ ἔκτρωματι with εὐχαρίστησεν πάντων, ὁ ἐλάχιστος, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανός, vss. 8, 9 as terminology which relates and contrasts Paul's experience to what has preceded in vss. 3-7. Munck's second possibility, where Paul is represented at his conversion as a Jewish embryo requiring Christian rebirth and growth, loses much of its force since ἔκτρωμα appears only to have been employed in this sense in the later theology of the church.

the apostles is demonstrated in his use of ἐλάχιστος¹ and οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανός. ἔσχον, vs. 8, like εἶτα and ἔπειτα in the preceding verses, is probably only temporal in its significance but Michaelis admits the possibility of Paul's considering himself last in rank as well as in chronological sequence.² Together with ἔκτρομα these expressions reveal Paul's sensitivity to his lack of association with Jesus and embarrassment over his former roll as a persecutor. Undoubtedly they remained sore points throughout his ministry and provided an avenue of attack for those who denied his authority.³

However, though I Cor. 15.3-11 is thus an acknowledgement of Paul's inferiority of background, it is just as obviously a claim to absolute equality in apostolic status. This is implicit first of all in the fact that Paul dares to attach his own name to an early Christian tradition. Although there is much divergent opinion regarding the form in which vss. 3-7 were communicated to Paul,⁴ there is general agreement that his own experience in vs. 8 represents an addition to whatever he had received.

1 In Eph. 3.8 Paul, expressing this same feeling, reinforces the superlative by setting it in comparative form, ἐλαχιστοτέρω, "less than the least". Cf. J.S. Stewart, op. cit., p. 145. Cf. above, p. 32, nt.2.

2 W. Michaelis, Die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen, p. 24, G. Sass, op. cit., p. 35, as with ἔσχατος in I Cor. 4.9 (cf. above, p. 60, nt.2) interprets ἔσχον eschatologically; Paul is the last member of the group fulfilling a ministry in anticipation of the parousia.

3 Cf. A. Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 157.

4 Vide. Extended Note 2 at the end of Part Two.

Paul discloses this in his use of *καὶ μοι* rather than just *ἐμοι* or *μοι* in vs. 8. Secondly Paul expresses his experience of the risen Christ with the same formula that he has applied to the other appearances, *ὡφθη* with the dative. Michaelis has referred to *ὡφθη* as "a technical term for designating the appearances of the risen one" which emphasizes that these appearances are "occurrences of revelation, confrontations with the resurrected Christ who reveals himself."¹ "When Paul in I Cor. 15.5f can include the Damascus experience with the other appearances, he has recognised it not only as equal in value to the others (especially in reference to his Apostolate and this in spite of his own unworthiness, 15.8f) but also as the same kind as theirs."²

Finally, Paul's desire for equality of status is most explicitly revealed in his application of the term *ἀποστόλος* to himself in vs. 9. The phrase *Ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων* represents a claim to membership in the group referred to in vs. 7 as *τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν*. This raises the question of the

1 W. Michaelis, "*ὁράω*," *T.W.N.T.*, V, p. 359. Cf. pp. 355f. This is illustrated by the usage of the aorist passive of *ὁράω* in the LXX. It translates *רָאָה* and is employed most frequently to designate an appearance of the divine *δόξα* when the emphasis is simply upon the presence of revelation rather than its perception, Ex. 16.10; Lv. 9.6,23; Nu. 14.10; 16.9; 17.7; 20.6; Is. 40.5; Ps. 16.15. Cf. Ps. 96.6; Is. 26.10; 35.2; Sir. 42.25 where the recognition of the revealed *δόξα* is the prominent thought. This distinction continues in the N.T. where the passive form is used of angelophanies, Lk. 1.11; 22.43; Acts 7.2,30 the appearance of Moses and Elijah, Mt. 17.3 and particularly of the resurrection of Christ, Lk. 24.34; Acts 9.17; 13.31; 26.19; 1 Cor. 15.3f.; 1 Tim. 3.16. These occurrences therefore are different from the *ὁράματα* and have no connection to dreams, sleep etc. The emphasis is upon the actual existence and communication of revelation as such. Cf. also J. Weiss, *The History of Primitive Christianity*, I, pp. 26f.

2 Vide. Extended Note 3 at the end of Part Two.

composition of this body. Holl believes that τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πάντων denotes a closed circle consisting of the Twelve and James. Just as Christ appears privately to Peter and then publically to the Twelve, vs. 5, so he appears to James alone and then to James with the Twelve, and these men are thereby authorized to found the church upon their apostolic witness.¹ Holl is probably correct in his view that the appearance to all the apostles is one event which constitutes a circumscribed group,² but there are factors which oppose his limiting this group to the Twelve plus James. For one thing Paul is not so much interested in founders of the church as he is in witnesses of the resurrection. After naming Peter, the Twelve, and James, vss. 5,7 as official witnesses we would not expect Paul to cite another resurrection appearance which involved no one other than those who have already been mentioned. Furthermore Holl's theory does not account for others whom Paul obviously accepts as apostles, such as Andronicus and Junias in Ro. 16.7, Barnabas and the brethren of the Lord in I Cor. 9.1-6. As Burton says τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πάντων "most naturally designates the whole of a group in distinction from a portion previously mentioned," and refers therefore to a wider circle, including

1 K. Holl, op. cit., pp. 49f., 54.

2 Contra E. Dobschütz, Ostern und Pfingsten, pp. 35,36 who interprets vs. 7 as referring to all those individuals who received personal calls from the risen Christ though not necessarily at one time. Cf. W. Michaelis, Die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen, p. 37 who supports Holl at this point.

the Twelve and James, but several others as well.¹

Vs. 7 also poses the question of the qualifications necessary for inclusion among the ἀπόστολοι πάντες. There must have been another factor involved besides an appearance of the risen Christ, or it would have otherwise been difficult to distinguish these men from the ἐπάνω πεντακοστοίς ἀδελφοῖς whom Paul mentions in vs. 6. The meaning of ἀπόστολος itself would suggest that these men were ones who had been sent forth with a commission.² "It thus appears that, besides an encounter with the Risen Lord, a personal commission was the only ground of apostleship."³ These two conditions are precisely corroborated in I Clement 42.1-3, Οἱ ἀπόστολοι ... παραγγέλιας οὖν λαβόντες καὶ πληροφορηθέντες διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πιστωθέντες ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ πληροφίας πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐξῆλθον.⁴ Clement has also recognised here that the verification of the apostle's call was afforded by the presence of the Holy Spirit in his

1 E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 370, 371; K. Lake, "The Twelve and the Apostles," The Beginnings of Christianity, V, pp. 55f. The observation of A.M. Farrar, "The Ministry in the New Testament," The Apostolic Ministry ed. K.E. Kirk, p. 130 is most pertinent: "The casual way in which we hear of Andronicus and Junias makes it likely enough that there were others who set out from Jerusalem bearing a commission from the risen Lord;" Cf. also V. Taylor, "The Church and the Ministry," E.T., LXII (1950,51), p. 271.

2 G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, M.N.T.C., p. 4.

3 K.H. Rengstorff, op. cit., p. 43. A Schlatter, op. cit., p. 399 writes of vs. 7: "Paul had information of yet another meeting of Jesus and his disciples in which he revealed himself to all the 'Apostles', to all to whom he gave the task to bear his call to mankind. This mission was not joined to what the five hundred Brethern experienced;" Cf. also A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, pp. 322, 323.

4 A.F., p. 27.

ministry.¹

Thus in I Cor. 15.8,9 when Paul terms himself an ἀπόστολος and adds his Damascus experience to the tradition of Christ's appearances with the characteristic ὡφθῆ formula, he has made a definitive claim to equality with the leaders of the church. He considers it his right to be included among a recognised circle extending beyond the Twelve composed of those who have seen the risen Christ and received a commission from him.²

Therefore we cannot support the view of Munck. Paul's appeal for apostolic status is not a condescension from a superior position of responsibility in the eschatological chain of events. Rather because Paul was a former enemy of the church, drawn suddenly and violently into Christianity after the period of resurrection appearances was thought to have ended, his claim to be an ἀπόστολος is a daring assertion. It is true that in vs. 10 a superiority is expressed. However this feeling does

1 Cf. E. Käsemann, op. cit., p. 34; A.D. Nock, St. Paul, pp. 49f.

2 "This is the qualification for post-Resurrection Apostleship which Paul claims to share with the Twelve and with James the Just; to have seen the Risen Lord and to have been commissioned by Him." T.W. Manson, The Church's Ministry, pp. 49,50. Most scholars who doubt that James, the Lord's brother, was numbered among the apostles, i.e. J. Munck, P.H., p. 84; G. Sass, op. cit., p. 134; H. Koch, "Zur Jakobusfrage Gal. 1.19," Z.N.W. XXXIII (1934), pp. 208,209, claim that as a resident in Jerusalem, James never performed an apostolic function. E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, p. 381 warns however, against a strict identification of the apostle with the missionary. Though the ἀπόστολος must have a commission from the risen Christ, this commission does not necessarily include an itinerant work. Acts 1.8 demonstrates that the commission of Christ entrusts the apostles with a world mission, but a mission which also involves a sojourn in Jerusalem. There is no mention in I Cor. 15.7 of such a commission being committed to James nor is there in the famous passage of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which records the tradition of his resurrection appearance. Hieronymus, Liber De

not arise from a divine assignment to a more significant place within the leadership of the church, but rather from the fact that Paul has outworked all of his peers in the apostolic circle.¹ This distinction as well as his dubious birth into Christian faith he immediately attributes to the working of God's grace, οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ ἀλλὰ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σὺν ἐμοί.

The necessity for Paul to rise from the lower level assigned him by his critics in order to assert his equality as an ἀπόστολος is present in other contexts. In I Cor. 9.1-18 it is obvious from the way that Paul introduces his argument that his apostolate had been seriously contested at Corinth, 'Ἡ ἐμὴ ἀπολογία τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀναγκρύνουσιν ἐστὶν αὕτη, vs. 3. It is difficult to determine the identity of these inquisitors but they are probably the same individuals who have stirred up the dissension of 1.11; 11.18.² The formal judicial terminology, ἀπολογία, ἀναγκρύνουσιν, which also appears in 4.3, suggests that their arguments had been precisely formed and widely circulated.³ We can assume that they denied apostleship to Paul because of the questionable circumstances of his background and entrance into Christianity, 9.1; 15.8,9 and

Viris Inlustribus, ed. E.C. Richardson from Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, O. Gebhardt, A. Harnack, XIV, I, 8. But W. Bousset, Der Erste Brief an die Korinther, p. 147 is nevertheless justified in his supposition that James' activity as a member and leader in the primitive Jerusalem community is a response to a summons of Christ which accompanies this appearance.

1 In the phrase ἀλλὰ περισσώτερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκοίτασα, αὐτῶν undoubtedly refers back to τῶν ἀποστόλων of vs. 9 and τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν of vs. 7.

2 Cf. above, p. 60, nt. 1.

3 W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, op. cit., pp. 56,95. W. Bousset, Der Erste Brief an die Korinther, p. 110 sees in this expression an indication that the Corinthians had appointed a certain day to conduct a hearing over Paul's apostolic status.

that they found evidence for their case in his renunciation of the apostolic right of support, 9.3-18.

In the face of this opposition Paul asserts his absolute equality as an apostle, *οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος*;. He claims an appearance of the risen Christ, *οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἑώρακα*;¹ and brings forward the faith of the Corinthians themselves as the proof of his apostleship *ἡ γὰρ σφραγίς μου τῆς ἀποστολῆς ὑμεῖς ἐστέ ἐν κυρίῳ*.² Then turning directly to the evidence that his Corinthian inquisitors had produced, he shows that his policy of denying remuneration, far from negating his position, is actually determined by the particular apostolic commission that has been granted to him.³

This same orientation underlies Gal. 1.11-24. In propagandizing Galatia, the Judaizers had impugned Paul's autonomy as an *ἀπόστολος*. They maintained that his authority was dependent

1 The perf. act. form *ἑώρακα* rather than the aor. pass. *ὤφθη* is probably dictated by stylistic considerations namely the three consecutive questions where Paul is the subject. W. Michaelis, "ὄρω" *T.W.N.T.*, p. 358. The preceding question, *οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος*;, confirms the fact that Paul is referring to the Damascus experience and interpreting it as a resurrection appearance. The initial question, *Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐλεῦθερος*;, forms a transition from the previous instruction over meat sacrificed to idols, 8.1-13 to the isolated discussion of the rights of an apostle, 9.1-18. With *ἐλεῦθερος*, 9.19, the original train of thought is resumed. H. Lietzmann, *Korinther I. II*, pp. 39, 40; J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, pp. 231-233.

2 P. Wernle, *op. cit.*, p. 169f. This is identical to the verification of the apostle's ministry by the Holy Spirit to which Clement referred, cf. above, p. 84.

3 The phrase *Ἡ ἐμὴ ἀπολογία τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀνακρίνουσιν ἐστὶν αὕτη*, vs. 3, therefore refers primarily to what follows, J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, p. 233, H. Lietzmann, *Korinther I. II*, p. 40 contra A. Robertson, A. Plummer, *First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, p. 179. The rhetorical questions represent a brief restatement of Paul's claim to be an *ἀπόστολος* but it is the carefully developed argument of vss. 3-18 which has the character of an *ἀπολογία*.

upon the original apostles but that in Galatia he had corrupted the message which the Twelve had given him to preach.¹ Paul counters this attack by introducing himself as an ἀποστολος who like the pillars of the church is οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ...vs. 1. Rather he was granted a resurrection appearance which involved at once a charge to be fulfilled; God was pleased ἀποκαλῆσαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμῶν, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, vss. 15,16. The only difference between Paul and the original apostles that is acknowledged is a chronological one. They were apostles before him, πρὸ ἡμῶν ἀποστόλους, vs. 17, but his apostleship, resting on a commission from the risen Christ, is still no less valid than theirs.²

1. A. Fridrichsen, A.M., p. 21 believes that the Judaizers had accused Paul of having no authorization at all. If Fridrichsen were correct however there would be no call for Paul's argument in Gal. 1.11-24 where he attempts to prove that he was free of the original apostles and Jerusalem during the formative years of his Christian ministry. The fact that he turns around in Gal. 2.1-10 to demonstrate that the pillar apostles nevertheless endorsed his message at a meeting 14 (17) years after his conversion, supports Burton's reconstruction of the Judaizers attack: "This denial seems to have taken the form of representing Paul as a renegade follower of the Twelve, a man who knew nothing of Christianity except what he had learned from the Twelve and preached this in a perverted form." E.D. Burton The Epistle to the Galatians, pp. LIV, LV; C. Weizsäcker, op. cit., pp. 261f. J.H. Ropes, "The Singular Problem of the Epistle of Galatians," Harvard Theological Studies, XIV (1929), pp. 12ff. O. Linton, "The Third Aspect. A neglected Point of View," Studia Theologica, III-IV (1949-50), pp. 92, 93.

2 P. Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, p. 32 says, "Paul speaks of the apostles 'who were before him' τοὺς πρὸ ἡμῶν ἀποστόλους which means; (1) that he recognizes their apostolic authority; (2) that he considers himself invested with an authority equal to theirs but not identical in its origin; (3) that he does not think the priority of their entrance gives them a superiority of claim over himself."

III

The Twelve as the Commissioned Apostles of Christ

Thus far our argument has assumed that Paul's rise from an inferior position and demand for equality have been made with reference to Peter and the Twelve. We have seen, however, that Fridrichsen and Munck not only deny this representation of Paul's claim, but they also are convinced that of the Twelve only Peter in Gal 2.7¹ is ever called an ἀπόστολος by Paul. Granted there is no unequivocal statement in the Epistles ascribing apostleship to the Twelve. But in the passages we have examined, I Cor. 15.3-11; I Cor. 9.1-18; Gal. 1.1-24, the exegesis favors the admission of the Twelve in each case and the combined evidence of all three is virtually conclusive.

In I Cor. 15.3-11 it is evident from vs. 5, where Christ appears to Peter and then to the Twelve, that the appearance to the apostles, vs. 7, could also incorporate the recipients of a previous appearance.² When we accept the inclusion of the Twelve in the ἀπόστολοι πάντες of vs. 7, then Paul's perspective in vss. 8-11 becomes understandable. He would be much more apt to call himself ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων and one who is οὐκ ἵκανός καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος if he were comparing himself to the Twelve rather than to a group of missionaries sent out by Christ as Munck holds.³ Especially the word ἔκπρᾶμα which compares a premature

1 J. Munck, P.A.T., pp. 104, 106f. also accepts ἀπόστολος in Gal. 1.19 as a reference to Peter.

2 Cf. above, pp. 82, 83. W. Michaelis, Die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen, p. 36.

3 J. Munck, P.A.T., p. 105.

miscarriage to a normal full term development would be most applicable in contrasting Paul's sudden, unprepared conversion with the gradual growth of the Twelve in company with Christ.

On the other hand Munck must explain why Paul, if he is conscious of possessing a ministry which surpasses that of the Twelve in its significance, chooses a designation for himself which has only been used of men who are far below the Twelve in their importance in the early church, and why, when he does this, this designation is denied him by his opponents.¹ The only answer Munck gives is that it is an act of humility and condescension on Paul's part.² But it is difficult to imagine Paul, struggling to maintain his authority in the community, being motivated by humility and condescension to identify himself in a category where he knows he does not belong.

In I Cor. 9.1-18 the identity of the apostles is raised by vss. 4,5 where Paul speaks of the right of certain individuals to have their expenses, viz. food, drink, support of a wife, borne by the community. Those who have exercised this privilege are designated οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κηρύττες. *λοιποὶ* could indicate the apostles (1) other than the brethren of the Lord and Peter, (2) other than Barnabas and Paul, ἢ μόνος ἐγὼ καὶ Βαρναβᾶς οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν vs. 6, (3) or both. However,

1 The latter is an especially formidable obstacle to Munck's position in view of his opinion that the opposition in Corinth as in Galatia is not initiated from outside but is purely local in its origin and development. J. Munck, P.H., pp. 79f, 127f.

2 J. Munck, P.A.T., p. 105.

μόνος in the emphatic position already distinguishes Paul and Barnabas from the ἀποστολοὶ of vs. 5 so that either the first or third alternative is favored. Furthermore Paul's admission of James as an apostle in Gal. 1.19, ἕτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ ἔιδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου,¹ makes it probable that the brethren of the Lord were included among the ἀποστολοὶ. Finally the fact that Paul's refusal of support was obviously used as evidence against his apostolic status, vs. 1, demonstrates that we are concerned here with a privilege that was granted to apostles. Therefore the most natural explanation of vs. 5 is that Paul cites the brethren of the Lord and Peter as men of note who are included in the whole circle of the apostles and who had availed themselves of the right of support.² Accordingly Paul reckons the Twelve among the λοιποὶ ἀποστολοὶ either because he or the Corinthians considered them less exemplary in the leadership of the early church in respect to the matter under discussion.

On the contrary Munck contends that I Cor. 9.5 is referring to three distinct groups to whom the right of support

1 H. Koch, op. cit., pp. 204f. by connecting εἰ μὴ exclusively with ἔιδον places Paul in the awkward position of having seen no one of note in all Jerusalem save Peter and James. It is much more reasonable to take εἰ μὴ with ἕτερον and the entire preceding phrase signifying that Paul saw no other apostles besides Peter and James. Cf. E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 60. J. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 84,85.

2 A.M. Farrer, op. cit., p. 127; J. Weiss, Der Erste Korintherbrief, pp. 234,235 and H. Lietzmann, Korinther I. II, pp. 40,41 support this view and suggest that Peter had been singled out by the Corinthians and contrasted with Paul in respect to the right of support.

was extended, the apostles (missionaries sent out by Christ), the brethren of the Lord, and Peter. However, he must explain in the context of his theory, why Paul does not call Peter an ἀπόστολος here when he does so in Gal. 1.19; 2.7. Munck's answer is that in I Cor. 9.5 Peter "is added to the first two groups as a man whose position made it natural that his name would be given separately."¹ This is no satisfactory explanation because it also accounts for Peter's special mention assuming that Paul does reckon him among the apostles. But of course Munck has recognised that if he were to accept Peter as an apostle in I Cor. 9.5 he would have to place him in the same category as the λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι and presumably the οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ κυρίου,² and this in effect would be an admission that Paul's eschatological use of ἀπόστολος was not confined to Peter but was extended to include the whole circle of the apostles.

In Gal. 1 the reference to the Twelve is more clearly expressed. Paul mentions his fifteen day visit with Peter, vs. 18, and then states in vs. 19 ἕτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου. We have seen that there is a possible question over the status of James,³ but the connection

1 J. Munck, P.A.T., p. 104.

2 K. Lake, "The Twelve and the Apostles," The Beginnings of Christianity, p. 56 states, "It is impossible to argue satisfactorily that the Brethren of the Lord are regarded as a class separate from the Apostles without admitting that Kephas also was not an Apostle, and to most minds this is a reductio ad absurdum."

3 Cf. above, p. 84, nt. 2; p.90, nt. 1.

of the ἑτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων to Peter is uncontested. Therefore the natural conclusion is that the other eleven are comprehended within the phrase ἑτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων. This makes it practically certain that vs. 17 οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους also includes Peter and the Twelve. E.D. Burton writes, "The reference is, of course, particularly to the Twelve, yet would include any, such as James, who had been recognised as apostles before Paul himself received the apostolic office."¹ Paul's argument depends in Gal. 1 on the timing and in Gal. 2 on the significance of his contacts with the recognised leaders of the Christian movement.²

Though Munck still prefers restricting the apostles in

1 E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, p. 54.

2 Cf. G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, pp. 28f. The contention of J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, p. 46, "Paul accordingly does not look upon the college of the Twelve as the leaders of the Church;" receives its principal support from Weiss' exegesis of εἶτα τοὺς δώδεκα in I Cor. 15.5. Weiss is justified in viewing the variants, ἐπειτα (A, A, 69), καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα (D*, G) and ἔνδεκα (D*, G) as later additions, the ἔνδεκα being an obvious attempt to harmonize the text with Mt. 28.16. Cf. Nestle. Nevertheless he has no grounds for dismissing εἶτα τοὺς δώδεκα itself as a scribal insertion. Ibid., p. 24, also Der erste Korintherbrief, p. 350. Apart from the ἐπειτα possibility the phrase is supported by both the S and R textual groups, and with εἶτα is attested by B and the powerful witness of P. 46 which of course has only been discovered since the death of Weiss, and might well have caused him to reconsider his position.

The fact that Paul therefore cited the Twelve in his original communication of this tradition at Corinth brings us to the conclusion of J. Wagenmann, Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf, p. 30. "If the word δώδεκα does not appear in the Epistles except in I Cor. 15.5, nevertheless this one occurrence proves conclusively, that Paul had mentioned them on his mission preaching. He represented them as recognised officials, when he speaks in Galatians of the πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀπόστολοι." H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, pp. 84f. demonstrates how the ascendancy of James the Lord's brother in Jerusalem, and the emphasis upon Peter and John within the apostolic circle are facts

Gal. 1.17 to missionaries sent out by Christ, he admits with qualification that τοὺς πρὸ ἑμοῦ ἀποστόλους may refer to the Twelve. In P.A.T. written in 1948 Munck states that if vs. 17 refers to the Twelve, "this passage is the first evidence that the use of the term is beginning to change so that 'the apostles' is used of the twelve, as it is in the post-Pauline period."¹ This is difficult to accept, even granting Munck's position, for it says in effect that Paul himself uses the post-Pauline meaning of ἀπόστολος in what is probably his earliest Epistle.

With the publication of P.H. in 1954 Munck offers a new explanation for Gal. 1.17. Assuming that the Twelve are in Paul's mind here, the phrase, "nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me" is a direct denial of an accusation made by his opponents. It is a free quotation which reflects the use that the Judaisers made of ἀπόστολος in their attack upon Paul. Already they had taken Paul's definition of ἀπόστολος and applied it to the Twelve.² This construction is no more satisfactory than Munck's earlier one.

(1) If οὐδὲ...τοὺς πρὸ ἑμοῦ ἀποστόλους is attributed even freely to the Judaisers it implies a recognition of Paul's apostleship on their part. But this is impossible since it is

which are not inconsistent (as Weiss maintains) with the recognition of the Twelve as the "real founders" and "actual authorities" of the church. Cf. also W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 6f., 66f.

1 J. Munck, P.A.T., p. 106.

2 J. Munck, P.H., p. 207.

their denial of his apostolic status that provokes the argument of Gal. 1 and 2. (2) In connecting Gal. 1.17 to the Galatian Judaizers in this way, what Munck has called a post-Pauline ἀποστολος development, actually begins before the writing of Paul's first Epistle. (3) Such a view requires Paul to have explained his ἀποστολος idea in such detail on his visits to Galatia that his opponents there were able to transfer this idea to the Twelve sometime before the writing of Gal. 1. However it is unlikely that Paul's apostolic consciousness had attained such a definitive form at this time. The witness of the Epistles suggests that it is not before but after the challenge and stimulation of his opposition that Paul's ἀποστολος concept is fully developed and expressed.¹

The fact that Munck feels constrained to give these explanations betrays the weakness of his case at this point, and the difficulties of the explanations themselves convince us that the usual interpretation of vs. 17 is the correct one. The τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους are the Twelve along with a few others who were the recognised leaders of the early church. Therefore in Gal. 1, as in I Cor. 9.1-18 and 15.3-11, all that has been said of the apostles can be said of the Twelve. The assignment of Paul to an inferior status and his consequent demand for equality are both directly related to them.

Against the view of Munck and Fridrichsen that the Twelve only become apostles when Paul's ἀποστολος idea has been transferred

¹ K.H. Rengstorff, op. cit., p. 53; O. Cullmann, C.E., p. 241.

to them, we must rather assert with Cullmann that they become apostles with the resurrection and commission of Christ.¹ Paul dares to share their claim only because he knows that their apostolate rests on the same foundation as his own.²

IV

The False Apostles of II Corinthians 10 - 13

In II Cor. 10-13 we have yet another passage which reveals Paul's struggle for equality and discloses a wider application of ἀπόστολος within the early church.³ Intruders whom Paul calls ψευδαπόστολοι, II Cor. 11.13 had threatened Paul's position in the Corinthian community through the defamation of his character, 10.1-6,8; 12.14-17; criticism of his methods, 10.9,10; 11.7-11; and primarily by denying his apostolic authority, 10.7; 11.1-5, 21ff; 12.1-13; 13.1-4,10. Two of Paul's most cherished plans were endangered: (1) Renewed tension could not help but affect the Corinthians contribution to Paul's offering for the Jerusalem saints, especially if as Munck conjectures, the funds available for this project had been drained by the

1 Thus K.H. Rengstorff, op. cit., p. 43; A. Richardson, op. cit., p. 322.

2 T.W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 48f.

3 Vide. Extended Note 4 at the end of Part Two.

demand of the ψευδαποστολοι for support, 11.7-15.¹ (2) Further trouble at Corinth would delay the completion of his eastern mission and thereby thwart the realization of his desire to carry the gospel to the West, 10.13-16.

In meeting this threat Paul once again asserts his equality in the difficult statement of 11.5, λογίζομαι γὰρ μηδὲν ὑστερηκέμαι τῶν ὑπερβάν ἀποστόλων (cf. 12.11). Munck, Lietzmann, Windisch, and Plummer think that Paul here is referring sarcastically to the ψευδαποστολοι.² However there are strong grounds for discounting this view: (1) In the preceding chapter Paul bluntly refuses either to classify himself with (ἐγκρίναι) or even compare himself to (συγκρίναι) the intruders in Corinth, 10.12. (2) In the preceding verse he accuses the intruders of preaching a Jesus other than the one he has preached, εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει ὃν οὐκ ἐκηρύξαμεν. Furthermore the Corinthians receive from them a spirit and gospel that is different from Paul's, ἡ πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβάνετε ὃ οὐκ ἐλάβετε, ἡ εὐαγγέλιον ἕτερον ὃ οὐκ ἐδέξασθε, καλῶς ἀνέχεσθε.³ It is difficult to imagine Paul con-

1 J. Munck, P.H., pp. 155f., 176f.

2 J. Munck, P.H., p. 172; H. Lietzmann, Korinther I. II, p. 144; H. Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief, p. 330; A. Plummer, Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, pp. 298, 299.

3 We therefore take the present form ἀνέχεσθε (P⁴⁶, B, D*) as the original and the construction as a simple condition assuming the reality of its premises. Vide. the identical construction in vs. 20 and the thorough treatment of the variants and the possible interpretations in H. Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief, pp. 325f.

denning the intruders in this way and then immediately claiming the same status. (3) This problem is even more boldly presented by vss. 13-15 where Paul denounces his opponents with the most scathing rebuke found in the Epistles. Can we believe that Paul in vs. 5 desires equality with those whom he reviles as false apostles ψευδαπόστολοι, deceitful workers ἐργάται δόλιοι, and servants of Satan, οἱ διᾶκονοι αὐτοῦ in vss. 13-15?¹

We have seen from I Cor. 9, I Cor. 15 and Gal. 1 that Paul's struggle for full apostolic status has proceeded with reference to the original apostles including the Twelve. II Cor. 10-13 is no exception. Therefore the ὑπερλίαν ἀποστολοι are most probably the first company of apostles, or at least distinguished members of this group, whom the intruders have elevated over Paul in their attempt to destroy his authority in the Corinthian community.² However, this does not require us to regard these intruders as officially authorized agents of the Jerusalem church as Pfleiderer, Meyer, and T.W. Manson have done.³ If

1 W. Bartlett, "St. Paul and the Twelve," E.T., XXXIX (1927, 1928), 43 states "to take it (οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀποστολοι) as referring to the 'false apostles' (II Cor. 11.13) is almost indefensible. These are spoken of not with gentle irony, but stern indignation." First parenthesis mine.

2 Accordingly there is a break between vs. 4 which concerns the intruders and vs. 5 which refers to the original disciples. But this view does not cut the verse out of its context as H. Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief, p. 330, claims. Rather vs. 5 connects directly to vs. 1 where Paul apologizes for his foolishness, ἀποροσύνη, thus exhibiting his usual self-consciousness in classing himself with the original apostles. This same characteristic is even more evident in the comparison with the ὑπερλίαν ἀποστολοι in 12.11.

3 O. Pfleiderer, Paulinism, trans. E. Peters, II, 37f; E. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, III, 455f. T.W. Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus: The Corinthian Correspondence," repr. from Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXVI (1942), 6,7.

they had possessed such impressive credentials we would not expect them to seek letters of recommendation from the Corinthians, 3.1f; and if they were trying to extend the authority of Peter, James and the Jerusalem church into Paul's communities in direct violation of the Gal. 2.9,10 agreement¹ we would not expect Paul simultaneously to be enthusiastically raising money for the Jerusalem church in fulfillment of this same agreement.² On the other hand we must account for an authority that was so respected by the Corinthians that it threatened to demolish Paul's status in his own community.

The most probable explanation is the one offered by Käsemann who traces the intruders to radical Judaizing circles within the Jerusalem community.³ From Gal. 2.1-10 we learn of a right wing faction, *ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι*, who obviously do not have the complete sympathy of the church leaders but nevertheless are able to exert considerable influence upon them. It is equally apparent that these Judaizers have dedicated themselves to undermining Paul's mission both in Jerusalem and in his own field and to bringing his converts within the framework of Jewish Christianity, Gal. 1-2; 5.1-12; 6.11-18; Acts 15.1-35; 21.15-36. From this perspective it is understandable how men suddenly appear in Corinth, who appeal to the original apostles without being specifically authorized by them, 11.5; 12.11, who are interested in

1 Cf. T.W. Manson, "St. Paul in Ephesus: The Corinthian Correspondence," *op. cit.*, p. 7.

2 Cf. J. Munck, *P.H.*, p. 172.

3 E. Käsemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 45ff.; also J. Wagenmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 39f., 49f; J. Hering, *La Seconde Épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament*, pp. 83,85.

letters of recommendation, 3.1, who style themselves "servants of righteousness", διδασκονοι δικαιοσύνης, 11.15, and who boastfully claim for themselves and for the church's leaders the superiority of Jewish background and descent, 10.21ff.¹

From this perspective the delicate position of Paul in II Cor. 10-13 is also revealed. His promise not to compare 10.12-18, immediately followed by the vigorous contrasts of 11.5, 21ff.; 12.11, the ordered argument 10.7-18 together with the bitter rebuke, 11.12-15, the use of irony, 11.5; 12.11, the extreme self-consciousness, 10.8, 12ff.; 11.1, 21; 12.1, 11, all are dictated by the peculiar nature of the issue at Corinth. Paul sees plainly that his conflict is with the intruders and not the original apostles, but the situation is complicated by the fact that his opponents have furthered their cause by claiming the support of these apostles. Paul must condemn the intruders, their methods, and their manner of appealing to the leaders of the church, but he must at the same time assert his equality with the original apostles and not give the impression of opposing their authority. "He must for the most part let the presuppositions of his opponents stand and still destroy the radical consequences that have been drawn from them. He ought to break decisively with the intruders in Corinth and yet cannot afford and does not desire to enter into conflict with Jerusalem and the original apostles."²

1 E. Käsemann, op. cit., pp. 45, 46.

2 Ibid., p. 47; Cf. also A. Schlatter, op. cit., pp. 635ff.

Munck, who views the Corinthian intruders as Jewish Christians but not Judaizers, observes that no trace of the Judaizing teaching found in Galatians is present in II Cor. 10-13.¹ However this seemingly cogent argument is neutralized by several factors: (1) the "other Jesus," the "different spirit" and the "different gospel," which the Corinthians readily accept from the intruders, echo the situation that Paul counteracts in Gal. 1.6-9. (2) It is probable that the intruders recognised that Paul's authority would have to be destroyed in the community before their propaganda for Law observance and circumcision could be advanced. Profiting from experience and adapting themselves readily to a Hellenistic environment, they employ the devices that have been effective in the past and hold in reserve the more distasteful aspects of their teaching.² (3) Paul's silence on the message of his opponents can also be explained by his expectation to be in Corinth almost immediately, 13.1. Under such conditions a short note asserting his authority coupled

1 J. Munck, P.H., p. 168.

2 M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, pp. 307, 310-313. P. Wernle, op. cit., I, 156f. is probably correct when he attributes the downfall of the Judaizing mission to the fact that "the immense majority of the Gentile Christians did not want to become Jews." The nature of the accusations against Paul, e.g. the "walking according to the flesh," 10.2, insufficient miracles, 12.11ff., lack of visions and revelations, 12.1-10, contemptible speech 10.10; 11.6, unimpressive presence, 1.10, have led K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, pp. 220ff. to doubt the existence of Judaizers at Corinth and to assert his ingenious explanation of Jewish πνευματικοί stemming from antinomian circles in Alexandria; also R.H. Strachan, op. cit., p. XXII. However, the appeal which Paul's opponents have made to the original apostles of the Jerusalem community 11.5; 12.11, and their obvious preoccupation with Jewish background and descent, 11.21ff. favor a Palestinian origin. Cf. H. Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief, pp. 24ff.

with the resolve to deal with any false teaching through the advance party, 8.1-7, 16-24, and upon his own arrival, would be a logical strategy, 13.1-14. (4) Finally the Epistle to the Romans, which in all probability was written in Corinth sometime after Paul's arrival there, II Cor. 8,9; Ro. 15.19-28; Acts 19.21; 20.2,3; 24.17, evidences the apostle's concern with the threat of Judaistic doctrine at this particular period. Ro. 15.23-27 also indicates that the issues at Corinth were resolved in Paul's favor during his sojourn there.

V

The Application of the Shaliah Concept to the Extended Use of Apostolos in the Early Church

II Cor. 11.13 demonstrates that the intruders at Corinth had introduced themselves as apostles, and the fact that Paul feels constrained to expose the illegitimacy of their claim leads us to suppose that the Corinthians had conceded their right to the title. This obviously represents an extension in the application of ἀπόστολος beyond the circumscribed group of ἀπόστολοι πάντες, I Cor. 15.7, composed of those who had received a commission from the risen Christ.¹ Several scholars account for this extension by connecting the intruder's use of

¹ J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, p. 97.

ἀποστολος to the Jewish institution of the $\pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ ¹

$\pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ ² a derivative from $\pi \dot{\zeta} \psi$ "to send", appears in the rabbinic literature to designate one who is commissioned to discharge a specific responsibility. (1) This commission can come from an individual, as in the case of the $\pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ who concludes on behalf of his principal the arrangement of a betrothal.³ (2) The $\pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ may be authorized by a group, for example the agent of the court who bore and served a decree of divorce.⁴ The Sanhedrin appointed delegates to prepare the High Priest for his administrations on the Day of Atonement,⁵ and individuals appointed to pray as representatives of the congregation were also designated $\pi' \pi \dot{\zeta} \psi$ ⁶ (3) Finally certain individuals,

1 T.W. Manson, The Church's Ministry, pp. 44,45; E. Käsemann, op. cit., pp. 51,52; G. Sass, op. cit., p. 33.

2 A thorough evaluation of the $\pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ concept and its relation to the New Testament ἀποστολος appears in K.H. Rengstorf, op. cit., pp. 11-53. Cf. also S. Krauss, "Die Jüdischen Apostel," Jewish Quarterly Review XVII (1905), 370-383; A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, trans. and ed. J. Moffatt, 65-67, 409-414; T.W. Manson, The Church's Ministry, pp. 31-52; G. Sass, op. cit., pp. 14-27; G. Dix, "The Ministry in the Early Church," The Apostolic Ministry, ed. K.E. Kirk, pp. 228-232. We attempt here only a brief summary of the application of $\pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$, the main conclusions which have been drawn for the interpretation of ἀποστολος together with some additional observations. The texts of the references from the Talmud and Midrash unless otherwise cited are located in the analysis of $\pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ by H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, op. cit., III, 2-4; IV, 149-152.

3 Qiddushin 2.1.

4 Gittin 3.6; 4.1 Qiddushin 41a.

5 Yoma 1.5; 3.11.

6 Berakhoth 5.5.

namely Moses, Elijah, Elisha and Ezekiel, were considered to have been commissioned by God for the performance of miraculous deeds for which divine power was required.¹

The Jewish $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \Psi$ institution is further attested in Christian literature. Justin speaks of officially appointed men, $\text{ἀνδρας χειροτονήσαντες ἐκλεκτοὺς}$ who were dispatched from Jerusalem on a Jewish counter mission.² Jewish apostles bearing official letters from Jerusalem, $\text{οἳ τε ἀπόστολοι αὐτῶν ἐπιστολὰς βιβλῖνας κομιζόμενοι}$, warning the diaspora of Christianity are also mentioned by Eusebius.³ The Theodosian Code refers to apostles of the patriarch appointed at a certain time to collect money, "quos ipsi apostolos vocant, qui ad exigendum aurum atque argentum a patriarcha certo tempore diriguntur."⁴ Epiphanius speaks of one of these apostles of the Patriarch named Joseph who was dispatched with letters to Cilicia and not only collects money but in the capacity of an apostle, οἷα ἀπόστολος , carries on rigorous reforms in the synagogues.⁵

It is obvious from this evidence that the distinctive quality of the $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \Psi$ is not the type of work he performs, nor the identity of his principal but rather the character of his

1 Baba Meṣi'a 86b; Midrash Ps. 78.5. In Qiddushin 23b, on the basis of the principle that the $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \Psi$ derives his position and function from the one he represents, Rabbi Huna b. Joshua concludes that the priests offering the sacrifices must be the representatives of God. They cannot be the agents of the congregation for the people were not permitted to perform sacrifices.

2 Justin, Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo, CVIII (P.G., VI, 725, 727).

3 Eusebius, In Essaiam 18.1 (P.G., XXIV., 213).

4 Text quoted in S. Krauss, op. cit., p. 374.

5 Epiphanius, Adversus Haereses, (P.G., XLII., 409-412, 424).

authorization. The work as well as the commissioning agent vary considerably from case to case but the specific nature of his authority is common throughout. (1) As a full representative he possesses the power and function of his principal. A man's $\overline{\eta}'\dot{\zeta}\psi$ is as the man himself. "For R. Joshua b. Karha said: 'How do we know that a man's representative is as himself? Because it is said, and the whole assembly of the congregation shall kill it (the Passover sacrifice) at even: does then the whole assembly really slaughter? surely only one person slaughters (an animal): hence it follows that a man's agent is as himself!'"¹ (2) The task which the $\overline{\eta}'\dot{\zeta}\psi$ performs, and the power which he possesses are wholly determined by his contract. When the terms of this contract are fulfilled the $\overline{\eta}'\dot{\zeta}\psi$ returns to his principal, surrenders his authority, and ceases to function as a representative. Thus in a letter of commendation given to Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba, his principal Jehuda II writes "Behold we send to you a great man as our shaliach; and he is our representative until such time as he comes back to us."²

In relating the Jewish $\overline{\eta}'\dot{\zeta}\psi$ to the Christian $\dot{\alpha}\pi\delta\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, we must therefore be extremely cautious in any comparison based on the identity of the principal who commissions the $\overline{\eta}'\dot{\zeta}\psi$ or the character of the work which the $\overline{\eta}'\dot{\zeta}\psi$ does. These features are only incidental to a concept which is concerned essentially

¹ Qiddushin 41^b (The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I, Epstein, p. 206)

² Text quoted in K.H. Rengstorf, " $\dot{\alpha}\pi\delta\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$," T.W.N.T., I, 417.

with a particular type of authority and relationship.¹ In this regard it is significant that the functions within Judaism that most nearly approximate to the ministry of the N.T. apostles are never described with the terminology of the $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ institution. Neither the prophets of the Old Testament who were called and equipped to bear God's word nor the Jewish missionaries who were contemporary with primitive Christianity were ever designated $\Pi' \eta \dot{\zeta} \psi$.² Furthermore certain scholars question the connection of the Jewish $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ to the New Testament $\alpha \pi \sigma \tau \omicron \lambda \omicron \varsigma$ because the existing evidence for the former taken from the Rabbinic and early Christian literature cannot be dated earlier than A.D. 70.³

Nevertheless we are justified in treating the $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ concept of authority and relationship as basic to the extended usage of $\alpha \pi \sigma \tau \omicron \lambda \omicron \varsigma$ in early Christianity. Two factors especially constrain us to date the initiation of the $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ institution well before the Christian era and even justify Rengstorff's tracing its origin to the exilic period: (1) The passages in the Old Testament which presuppose the later Rabbinic usage, II Chron. 17.7-9;⁴ I Sam.

1 Thus A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, I, 413f. strains the application of the $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ institution, by basing a comparison upon the nature of the task performed. The Jewish $\Pi' \eta \dot{\zeta} \psi$ collecting money throughout the Diaspora for the sake of the Patriarch provide the background for Harnack's interpretation of Paul as the $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ of the original apostles raising funds in his own area to support their work in Jerusalem.

2 G. Sass, op. cit., p. 19; K.H. Rengstorff, op. cit., pp. 19, 23. The application of the pass. part. $\Pi' \eta \dot{\zeta} \psi$ to Ahijah in I Kgs. 14.6 is a partial exception.

3 K. Lake, "The Twelve and the Apostles," The Beginnings of Christianity I, V, 49; A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, p. 324.

4 On the basis of II Chron. 17.7-9, S. Krauss, op. cit., p. 382 believes that $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ was employed in the technical sense of the $\Pi' \dot{\zeta} \psi$ institution in the post-exilic period.

25.40-42; II Sam. 10.1-11.1. (2) and the single occurrence of ἀπόστολος in the LXX where it translates the passive participle Π'ζψ and refers to Ahijah as the one commissioned of God to bear the divine word to Jeroboam's wife, I Kings 14.6.¹

Of course the conclusive evidence for the existence of the Π'ζψ concept in the time of primitive Christianity is the New Testament itself.² Thus in II Cor. 8.23 when Paul designates the two brethren ἀπόστολοι he obviously is not referring to a commission of the risen Christ. They are rather ἀπόστολοι εκκλησιῶν, men appointed by the Macedonian churches, 8.19 (cf. 8.1) to be their representatives in bearing the Gentile collection to Jerusalem, Acts 20.1-6. Paul requests the Corinthians to treat them with utmost respect, 8.24. Similarly in Phil. 2.25, Epaphroditus is called the ἀπόστολος of the Philippian church, a man who is to be honoured, καὶ τοὺς τοιοῦτους ἐντίμους ἔχετε, 2.29, for the manner in which he fulfilled his delegated responsibility, 2.30. Paul himself is conceived as a Π'ζψ type apostle of the church of Antioch by Luke's source in Acts 13.1 - 14.28. The details of 13.1-3 represent a formal delegation of authority for

1 K.H. Rengstorff, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-16. It is noteworthy that the connection of Π'ζψ to the N.T. ἀπόστολος is not the invention of modern scholarship but was recognised as early as Jerome: Jerome, *Epistolam Ad Galatas*, 1.1 (P.L. XXVI, 335), "Apostolus autem, hoc est 'missus' Hebraeorum proprie vocabulum est, quod Silas (Al. Silai) quoque sonat, eui a mittendo 'missi' nomen impositum est."

2 The observation of A. Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, I, 409 that Jewish Π'Π'ζψ must have existed in Christ's time "since the Jews would hardly have created an official class of 'apostles' after the appearance of the Christian apostles," is quite valid and is supported by S. Krauss, *op. cit.*, p. 371.

a particular missionary task.¹ Furthermore Paul is designated an ἀπόστολος only two times in Acts, and both occurrences are in the context of this mission, 14.4,14. When the work is fulfilled he returns to Antioch and resumes his former place in the community, 14.26-28.²

From this perspective we can understand the influence which the Judaizing intruders were able to wield at Corinth. Not only did they originate in Jerusalem as we have seen but they also claimed to be ἀπόστολοι, II Cor. 11.13, that is to possess a Π'Ψ type relationship certified by letters of commendation, II Cor. 3.1f., which established them as the actual bearers of Jerusalem's authority in the Corinthian community.³ Paul exposes this claim as false, οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι ψευδο-ἀπόστολοι, and their activity as dishonest, ἐργάζονται δόλιοι, 11.13. We can infer from this that although the intruders presented themselves as officially appointed delegates of the whole

1 B.S. Easton, The Purpose of Acts, p. 18; A. Loisy, op. cit., pp. 140, 141.

2 Vide. Extended Note 5 at the end of Part Two.

3 The situation at Antioch, Gal. 2.11ff. can be taken as a parallel. Though the men sent from James, τινες ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, vs. 12, are not designated ἀπόστολοι they must have possessed or at least claimed a Π'Ψ type authority which gave them the influence and prestige of James himself. Otherwise it is difficult to understand how Peter and Barnabas could yield to their persuasion, K. Holl, op. cit., p. 57. At any rate we can conclude from Gal. 1.1, Παῦλος ἀπόστολος, οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, that there were cases of apostles being commissioned by men in the early church. K. Lake, "The Twelve and the Apostles," The Beginnings of Christianity, V, 50.

Jerusalem community, they were in fact the deputies of the narrow right wing party which Paul himself encountered in Gal. 2.1-10, τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς, Gal. 2.12.¹ Furthermore in their attempt to depose Paul at Corinth and replace his gospel with their own Judaistic doctrine they were overstepping their rights as representatives of a minority in the Jerusalem church and acting as if their commissioning principal were Christ himself, μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ, 11.13.

VI

The Application of the Shaliah Concept to the Apostles of Christ

The preceding section raises the question of whether the $\Pi' \dot{\Upsilon} \Psi$ concept has any significance for the ἀπόστολοι like Paul who distinguished themselves by tracing their commission to the risen Christ. Both Holl and Käsemann interpret the ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν from the perspective of the Jewish $\Pi' \dot{\Upsilon} \Psi$ but question its application to the ἀπόστολοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.² Rengstorf has emphasized the unprecedented aspects of the Christian ἀπόστολος: his appointment by Christ for an extended period within the new

1 Acts 15.23-29 records an occasion when the Jerusalem church exposes certain trouble makers in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia as unauthorized representatives of their community and at the same time officially accredits others to clarify the situation.

2 K. Holl, op. cit., p. 52; E. Kaseman, op. cit., p. 51.

community, his endowment with the Holy Spirit and the capacity to perform miracles, his call to a preaching and missionary task.¹ Thus the complete originality of Christ, the commissioning principal, and the absolute uniqueness of the responsibility which he assigns forbid all comparisons and justify Lake's comment upon ἀπόστολος: "Of all the technical terms of the New Testament it is most markedly and exclusively Christian."²

Nevertheless there is a remarkable correspondence between Paul's understanding of his work and the Jewish נָשִׁיט institution (1) Paul's conviction that he stands in Christ's stead in the world is illumined by the Rabbinic dictum, "A man's נָשִׁיט is as a man himself." This identity with Christ, on the one hand, explains Paul's capacity for miracles and signs, Ro. 15.18,19; II Cor. 12.12, and his exercise of an authority in his communities which extends to the power of excommunication itself. On the other, it reveals the meaning of Paul's suffering as a daily participation in Christ's death so that the power of Christ's life may be released.³ (2) Paul, as we have seen views his entire mission as a distinct and specific responsibility that has been entrusted to him by Christ.⁴ (3) His anticipation of

1 K.H. Rengstorff, op. cit., pp. 40-48, though Rengstorff also insists that the content of the New Testament ἀπόστολος idea only comes to light through the נָשִׁיט institution, pp. 25-41.

2 K. Lake, "The Twelve and the Apostles," The Beginnings of Christianity, V, 50.

3 Cf. above, pp. 21, 59-64. P. Wernle, op. cit., I pp. 119ff., 162f., sees Paul as both the ambassador of Christ and the servant of Christ. Cf. also A.D. Nock, op. cit., pp. 51, 177; P. Gardner, The Religious Experience of Saint Paul, p. 51.

4 Cf. above, pp. 44-52, 66-69.

the time when this commission shall be fulfilled and he shall be reunited with Christ is an inseparable part of his vocational perspective.¹ Thus, although Christ and the Christian mission are totally unique, the structure of Paul's apostolic consciousness parallels the $\pi\acute{\nu}\delta\psi$ concept of authority and relationship.

We have less information concerning the vocational consciousness of the other ἀπόστολοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Nevertheless there are remarkable traces of a $\pi\acute{\nu}\delta\psi$ pattern in Mt. 28.16-20 and Acts 1.6-11, the two passages which Holl connects with the commission of the risen Christ to the Twelve. "But apart from Paul one is required and justified to claim also for the original apostles something similar, a commission of the risen one. A possible mission of the disciples during the lifetime of Jesus is not sufficient to explain the position which they now claim as his apostles. For with the resurrection a completely new content was added to the preaching. In other words there must have existed at one time something similar to that described in Mt. 28.19 and Acts 1.8, an appearance by which the Twelve received the formal command to work for the cause of Jesus through the word."²

(1) In both these passages we find an obvious delegation of authority and power. The inferential particle οὖν in Mt. 28.19 reveals that the Twelve are to go and make disciples, πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύετε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, in the strength of the

1 Cf. above, pp. 52-69.

2 K. Holl, op. cit., p. 53; cf. also J. Wagenmann, op. cit., p. 20.

authority given to Christ, ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία, vs. 18.¹ The communication of divine power to the Apostles in Acts 1.8 is promised with the coming of the Holy Spirit, ἀλλὰ λήμψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς. (2) Furthermore the Twelve go out as the representatives of Christ. Not only do they possess his authority but they are to baptize in his name, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, Mt. 28.19, and his presence will remain with them, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, vs. 20.² This is also affirmed in the Acts account when Christ claims the apostles as his own witnesses, καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες, vs. 8.³ (3) In both passages the Twelve are appointed

1 This corresponds to the designation of Christ as the ἀπόστολος of God in Heb. 3.1. In his capacity as God's π'ςψ he delegates the divine authority which he himself possesses to his own π'η'ςψ, καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέν με ὁ πατήρ, καὶ γὰρ πέμψω ὑμᾶς, Jn. 20.21. I Clement 42.2 (A.F., p. 27), presents this same perspective, ὁ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

2 Accordingly, H.E.W. Turner, Jesus Master and Lord, pp. 284f., is probably correct in his view that the original command instituted baptism in the name of Christ alone, Acts 8.16; 19.5; I Cor. 1.13, and that the trinitarian formula of Mt. 28.19 reflects the early extension of the baptismal formula. Thus also E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, trans. J. Marsh, pp. 236f.

3 Thus, although the designation ἀπόστολος does not appear in the commission of Acts 1.6-11, we may still conclude that the π'ςψ concept of authority and relationship underlying this commission prompts the usage of ἀπόστολος in the immediate context, vs. 2. Cf. B. Reicke, "The Risen Lord and His Church," Interpretation, XIII (1959), 157f., 166. We can also support the judgement of K.H. Rengstorff, op. cit., p. 40, and K. Lake, "The Twelve and the Apostles," The Beginnings of Christianity, p. 51 that the application of the Greek term is to be traced to Christ's use of the Aramaic π'η'ςψ to refer to the Twelve. However it is probable from the occurrences of ἀπόστολος in the Synoptic Gospels that the Twelve were only given this title in the context of the special mission described in Mt. 10.1ff.; Mk. 6.7ff.; Lk. 9.1ff. The delegation of authority for this work constitutes the most obvious parallel to the institution in the New Testament. Cf. V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, pp. 621, 622. Christ's using π'η'ςψ of the disciples during the course of this mission undoubtedly provides the precedent for the renewed application of ἀπόστολος when the Twelve receive this more permanent commission following the resurrection.

to a specific mission which involves making disciples in all nations, μαθητεύετε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Mt. 28.19, and bearing the witness of Christ to the ends of the earth, καὶ ἔσοσθέ μου μάρτυρες...καὶ ἕως ἔσχατου τῆς γῆς, in Acts 1.8.¹ (4) Finally the commission given to the Twelve is not indefinite in duration but foresees a point of fulfillment which coincides with the return of Christ.

It is this aspect of Mt. 28.16-20 and Acts 1.6-11 which Cullmann has underscored. Noting the words of Christ in Mt. 28.20, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάντες τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, he writes, "This promise does not have originally the vague significance which we have tried to attribute to it, but it makes allusion to the essential eschatological character of the missionary order; it corresponds to the lapse of time which precedes the end and during which it is necessary to preach the gospel to the Gentiles."² Cullmann takes a similar view of the commission in Acts. "In Acts 1.6-8 Christ focuses the attention of the impatient disciples on the cause of the chronological problem of the apocalyptic events, on the necessary and prior action of the Holy Spirit which here uniquely considered as missionary agent will empower them during the time which separates his resurrection from his return, 'to give witness of him to the ends of the earth.'"³ Moreover

1 Vide. Extended Note 6 at the end of Part Two.

2 O. Cullmann, C.E., pp. 234, 235; Thus also C.H. Dodd, "Matthew and Paul," New Testament Studies, p. 61.

3 O. Cullmann, C.E., p. 233.

it is significant that this delegation of authority and responsibility concludes with the promise that Christ will come again, οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναλημφθεὶς ἀπ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οὕτως ἐλεύσεται ὃν τρόπον ἐθεάσαθε αὐτὸν πορευόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, vs. 11.¹

This evidence from Mt. 28.16-20 and Acts 1.6-11 together with the testimony of Paul's vocational consciousness leads to the conclusion that the $\pi\acute{\nu}\psi$ concept is valid for the ἀπόστολοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as well as the ἀπόστολοι ἀνθρώπων and the ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν. ἀπόστολος in the New Testament, whether applied to Peter or to the intruders in Corinth, signifies that the person so designated has a particular type of authority and relationship which he derives from his commissioning principal.

However, when this principal is Christ himself and when the commission involves a world mission, a unique and unprecedented

1 The eschatological significance of the work of Christ's original disciples is implicit also in the choice of Twelve. They represent the twelve tribes of the New Israel of God and are appointed to rule in the eschatological kingdom, Mt. 19.28; Rev. 21.14. A Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, pp. 313-319; H. Lietzmann, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. 84. We have confirmation of the typological importance of the Twelve not only in the appointment of Matthias, Acts 1.15-26 but also in the symbolic use of δώδεκα in the tradition which Paul communicates in I Cor. 15.5. Cf. above, p. 92, nt. 2. S.E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts", The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, pp. 133f. has conjectured that the twelve laymen who, with three priests, are given authority in the Essene Brotherhood, I. Q.S. 8.19 (D.S.S., II:2) possessed a symbolic significance within this apocalyptic community which paralleled that of the twelve disciples of Jesus. All this evidence supports the view of A. Fridrichsen, A.M., p. 18, that the appointment of the Twelve extends to the establishment and rule of the eschatological Kingdom. However we are not justified like Fridrichsen to restrict the Twelve to this function since the commission of Mt. 28.16-20 and Acts 1.6-11 clearly contemplates a responsibility in the interval between the resurrection and parousia.

apostolate is created. The resultant circle of individuals are οἱ ἀπόστολοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, designated οἱ ἀπόστολοι πάντες in the early tradition, I Cor. 15.7, called οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι by the intruders at Corinth, II Cor. 11.5; 12.11, and never referred to by Paul without the article, Ro. 16.7; I Cor. 4.9; 9.5; 15.7,9; Gal. 1.17,19; Eph. 2.20; 3.5.¹ It is within this group that Paul identifies himself and, when excluded by his opponents, he dares to assert his equality with οἱ ἀπόστολοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Like them he has been authorized to participate in a world mission as a fully accredited representative of Christ. Like them he traces his commission to a resurrection appearance and anticipates its fulfillment in the parousia.

VII

A Summary of Conclusions Reached in Part Two with Particular Reference to the Use of Apostolos in the Post-Apostolic Church

In accordance with the above evidence, we can conclude with Cullmann that Paul uses ἀπόστολος to signify a vocational perspective which he shares with a limited circle of individuals

¹ Conversely the article is not employed with the ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν, II Cor. 8.23; Phil. 2.25. Of course no great significance can be attached to the absence of the article since a given context could easily dictate its application to the ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν as well. The anarthrous usage of ἀπόστολοι in I Cor. 12.28,29; Eph. 4.11 probably refers not only to apostles of Christ (K.H. Rengstorf, op. cit., pp. 104f.) but to all who were

in the early church. I Cor. 15.3-11; I Cor. 9.1-18; and Gal. 1.1-24 demonstrate that this group includes the Twelve and a few others. When Paul designates himself an ἀπόστολος he is not claiming, as Munck and Fridrichsen have contended, an exclusive eschatological call which he alone has received. Rather he is seeking to identify himself within this circle whose members have been commissioned by the risen Christ for the interval between the resurrection and parousia. ἀπόστολος therefore defines what Paul has in common with the Twelve and not what distinguishes him.

When Paul speaks of his own special responsibility he does not use ἀπόστολος but employs terminology like οἰκονόμος μυστηρίων θεοῦ, σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων and the other vocational images that we located above.¹ Even then, however, he is concerned to place what has been committed particularly to himself in the context of the whole apostolic ministry. In Eph. 3.2-11, a passage which Munck accepts as a true representation of Paul's ἀπόστολος concept,² Paul's commission is described as an οἰκονομία, vs. 2, a manifestation of God's μυστήριον in which the Gentiles are freely incorporated into the body of Christ, vss. 3-6. But the μυστήριον is not the private property of Paul but has also been

designated ἀπόστολος in the early church regardless of their commissioning principal.

1 Cf. above, pp. 37-64.

2 J. Munck, P.A.T., p. 99 quotes Eph 3.2-11 as a legitimate expression of Paul's viewpoint; but later p. 100 without accounting for the apparent contradiction, he interprets Eph. 3.5 together with 2.20 and 4.11 as examples of the post-Pauline development of ἀπόστολος.

revealed τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις, vs. 5.¹

Likewise when Paul uses the appearance of the gladiators in the arena to illustrate the deepest meaning of his sufferings, I Cor. 4.8-11,² the application is not to him alone but to "us apostles," δοκῶ γάρ, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐσχάτους ἀπέδειξεν, vs. 9. Paul's statement in Eph. 2.20 that the church is built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῇ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν,³ is therefore consistent with this concern to locate his own special task in a wider context. Though he considers himself a σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων charged with the pioneer mission of laying foundations in Gentile communities, I Cor. 3.10ff.⁴ he attributes the broader foundation of the

1 The use of ἅγιος with ἀπόστολος in vs. 5 has often been cited in the argument against the Pauline authorship of Ephesians. Vide the discussion in M. Dibelius, An die Epheser Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, pp. 106f. The suggestion of T.K. Abbott, Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, The International Critical Commentary, p. 82, that modern connotations of holiness should not be allowed to displace the Biblical concept of something "set apart for a sacred purpose" is well taken. The fact that the ἀπόστολοι are set apart from τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων as divinely chosen recipients of revelation dictates the usage of ἅγιος here as it does in Col. 1.26. E. Haupt, op. cit., p. 106; C. Masson, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Ephésiens, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, p. 173.

2 Cf. above, pp. 59-64.

3 We take προφῆται, I Cor. 12.29; Eph. 2.20; 3.5; 4.11 to refer to the extensive New Testament ministry described in I Cor. 13.2; 14.1-37; Acts 11.27,28; 15.32; 21.10,11. A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, I, 414-444; A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, p. 335; contr. K.H. Rengstorff, op. cit., p. 60. It is evident from Acts 13.1-3 that προφῆται and δίδασκαλοι could be appointed ἀπόστολοι by a church.

4 Cf. above pp. 44-52.

Church to the whole apostolic and prophetic ministry. Finally, the designation "apostle to the Gentiles," ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν οὖν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, Ro. 11.13 can be considered an expression of Paul's particular assignment, but the usage of ἀπόστολος indicates that he joins this assignment to the mission which Christ commits to all apostles.

However, we also conclude with Cullmann that Paul's apostolic consciousness attains a higher clarity and intensity than that of the other apostles. Apparently ἀπόστολος did not have the currency in the primitive church that it did in the second generations of Christianity and thereafter. The early tradition of I Cor. 15.3ff. indicates that the original disciples of Jesus were customarily called οἱ δώδεκα and I Cor. 9.5; Gal. 1.19 suggests that οἱ ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ κυρίου was the most common title for James and his brothers. The obvious explanation is that these designations were preferred because they emphasized an intimate association with Jesus. Paul did not share this earthly connection ^{with} to Jesus but he did stand on common ground with the Twelve and James in his relation to the risen Christ. He therefore applied to himself the term which expressed this common relationship, ἀπόστολος.¹

To this extent we can agree with Munck and Fridrichsen that Paul has a decisive influence in the application of ἀπόστολος to the Twelve. His heightened apostolic consciousness gives the term a prominence and establishes it as the standard designation

¹ Cf. A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, pp. 402-404.

for the recognised leaders of the church. But we cannot agree that this development originates with Paul's own call. Rather ἀπόστολος designates the Twelve and others as soon as the commission of the risen Christ re-establishes the $\Gamma\acute{\iota}\psi$ relationship which they had with Jesus for a short period during his ministry. The narrower term οἱ δώδεκα is more common but οἱ ἀπόστολοι is nevertheless applied to the Twelve in the earliest days of the church.¹ Otherwise there is no sufficient reason why Paul's claim to be an ἀπόστολος is denied him by his opponents and vigorously defended by Paul himself.

We can also concur with much that Munck says regarding the application of ἀπόστολος in the later Gentile church. Not only does Paul establish the term as the preferred designation for the original leaders of the Christian community, but his particular apostolic consciousness becomes a key factor in interpreting the ministry of the Twelve. In fragments of the Preaching of Peter which are quoted in Clement of Alexandria and which probably date from the earlier half of the second century,² the first disciples are commanded to remain twelve years in Jerusalem and then to journey throughout the world with the gospel. As a

1 The original relationship between these two terms is accurately preserved in Lk. 6.13, καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν, ("and from them having chosen Twelve, he also called them apostles") and also in Mk. 3.14 if we accept the reading of Westcott and Hort attested by B, α , W, and Θ . The adjunctive καὶ indicates that ἀπόστολος was an alternative designation for δώδεκα and it seems only to have been employed during the period when the Twelve were commissioned to share Jesus' work, Matt. 10.1ff; Mk. 6.7ff.; Lk. 9.1ff. Cf. above p. 111, nt. 3.

2 The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. F.L. Cross, p. 1052; E.J. Goodspeed, A History of Early Christian Literature, pp. 130, 309.

result of preaching no one would be able to say ὅτι ἠκούσαμεν .¹ This trend continues in the Apologists who obviously regard the Twelve as apostles appointed by Jesus to the Gentile mission.² At the beginning of the third century the apocryphal Acts of Thomas describes the original disciples dividing the world in Twelve areas and then drawing lots for their individual responsibilities.³ Of all the literature of the early Christian era, the Pistis Sophia, emanating from Gnostic sources around A.D. 250⁴, presents the most radical and exalted view of the Twelve. They are called the deliverers of the world and receive from Christ twelve powers of salvation which he imparts to their mothers at the time of his incarnation.⁵

However, in opposition to Munck and Fridrichsen we must again locate the origin of these developments in the appointment which the Twelve receive from the risen Christ. The clear $\Pi^{\prime}\delta\psi$ pattern of authority and relationship that underlies Mt. 28.16-20 and Acts 1.6-11 leads to the acceptance of these passages as substantially reliable accounts of this appointment, and

1 Clement of Alexandria, Stromatum, Lib. VI. 5,6 (P.G., IX, 264, 269, 272).

2 Aristides, Apologia, XV (ed. J.R. Harris, J.A. Robinson, p. 110); Justin, Apologia, I. 39 (P.G., VI, 388); Tertullian, Apologeticus, XXI (P.L., I, 402, 403).

3 Acta Apostolorum, Apocrypha (ed. C. Tischendorf, p. 190).

4 The Apocryphal New Testament, ed. and trans. by M.R. James, p. XXIII; E.J. Goodspeed, op. cit., pp. 59, 310.

5 Pistis Sophia 10, 11 (ed. M.G. Schwartz, J.H. Petermann, p. 8).

provides the reason why the designation ἀπόστολοι is reassumed by the Twelve following the resurrection. From these sources we can conclude that the commission to act as Christ's representatives in the time before the parousia involved the Twelve from the beginning in a world mission. The transfer of Paul's apostolic consciousness to the Twelve in the later Gentile church does not therefore establish them as missionaries to the world. They receive this perspective from Christ. Rather the effect of this transfer is to give to each of the Twelve the special vocation which Paul exercised within the total apostolic mission. Through Paul's influence, the Twelve come to be regarded as itinerant missionaries engaged in a pioneer work to the Gentiles. Neither the Epistles nor Acts indicate, however, that they fulfilled the commission of Christ in this specifically Pauline manner.

Naturally when the coverage of the entire world is attributed to the Twelve by the later Gentile church, the significance of Paul in the apostolic mission is minimized, as Munck has observed.¹ It is noteworthy, however, that many of our earliest non-canonical sources place him on the same level as the Twelve. Clement of Rome accepts Paul and the Twelve on equal terms and describes them preaching everywhere and grounding the new Christian communities.² Particularly in the writings

1 J. Munck, P.A.T., p. 110.

2 I Clement 5.3-7; 42.1-4; 47.1-4 (A.F., pp. 8, 27, 30).

that stem from Asia Minor, Paul is highly regarded. Both Ignatius¹ and Polycarp² hold Paul with the Twelve as the apostles. In the apocryphal Acts of Paul written by an Asian presbyter around A.D. 160,³ the Corinthian elders reacting to two gnostic teachers write to Paul, "for we have never heard such words from thee nor from the other apostles."⁴ Perhaps the highest accreditation of Paul comes from Irenaeus of Lyons in the latter half of the second century, when he refers to Peter and Paul as the two most glorious apostles, "et omnibus cognitae, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo."⁵

Furthermore there are instances in non-canonical sources where ἀπόστολος applies to persons beyond both the Twelve and Paul. The Didache prescribes specific regulations for the treatment of itinerant apostles and the implication that these apostles have abused their privileges makes it certain that the reference is not to the Twelve, Didache 11.3-6.⁶ Arguing for

1 Ignatius to the Ephesians 12.2; to the Magnesians 13.2; to the Romans 4.3 (A.F., pp. 109, 115, 121).

2 Ignatius to Polycarp 9.1,2 (A.F., pp. 171, 172).

3 Tertullian, Liber de Baptismo, XVII (P.L., I, 1219, 1220).

4 Acts of Paul, I 4 (trans. from Coptic ms. by M.R. James, op. cit., p. 289). Cf. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity II, 782-786.

5 Irenaeus, Contra Haereses, Lib. III. 3, 2 (P.G., VII, 848). Furthermore Irenaeus not only finds the Twelve but also Paul prefigured in the O.T. He states that Christ has been preached through all the world through the tribe of Benjamin namely through Paul who was a Benjamite, ὁ Χριστός...διὰ δὲ τοῦ Βενιαμίν, τοῦ Παύλος, εἰς πάντα τὸν κόσμον κηρυχθεὶς ἐδοξάσθη, Irenaeus, Fragmenta, XVII (P.G., VII, 1239).

6 (A.F., p. 222).

the literary dependence of the Didache upon Barnabas and Hermas, Vokes dates the work between A.D. 155 and 250.¹ According to him the Didache is mainly concerned with exposing the Montanist prophets and the vague descriptions of the ἀπόστολοι are inserted to conform to the New Testament pattern of apostles, prophets and teachers, I Cor. 12.28; Eph. 4.11.² However, though the reference to the ἀπόστολοι is brief, it is certainly not vague and the details presented do not correspond with an alleged intention of the author to draw a parallel to the apostles of the New Testament. Burton, Meyer, and Goguel make the more plausible assertion that these Didache regulations contemplate an actual situation at the turn of the first century, but one that is local and temporary in its application.³ Although the ἀπόστολοι 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ have obviously passed from the scene there still exist scattered remnants of itinerant ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν (or ἀπόστολοι ἀνθρώπων) who, like their New Testament predecessors, honourably or

1 E. Vokes, The Riddle of the Didache, pp. 27-61.

2 Ibid., pp. 160-173; Vokes' argument closely follows J.A. Robinson, Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache, pp. 43-68; 97-103, who bases his date of A.D. 140-160 upon a literary analysis of the Didache and asserts that the ἀπόστολοι of Didache 11.3-6 are the "free creation of the writer," p. 98.

3 E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, p. 383; E. Meyer, op. cit., I, 269f.; M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity p. 267. The relatively early date, A.D. 90-120, which this view requires for the Didache has been defended from the literary standpoint by B.H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, pp. 279-287; as well as in B.H. Streeter, "The Much-Belaboured Didache," J.T.S., XXXVII (1936), 369-374. With analogies to the Synoptic problem, Streeter supports the view that the Didache and Barnabas are drawing from a common source which includes the "Two Ways," Didache 1-6, Barnabas 18 - 21, (A.F., pp. 217-220; 262-265); Cf. also E.J. Goodspeed, op. cit., pp. 158-170.

falsely claim the rights of authorized representatives.¹

In Hermes, Vision III 5.1; Similitude IX 15.4; 16.5; 25.2,² Harnack finds another instance of the application of ἀποστολος to a circle of persons beyond the Twelve.³ Lightfoot moreover contributes several examples of the broad use of the word in early Christian literature.⁴ Both Irenaeus⁵ and Tertullian⁶ refer ἀποστολος to the Seventy of Lk. 10.1-20. Clement of Alexandria admits Barnabas and even Clement of Rome as apostles.⁷ The extensive application of the term is discussed by Origen⁸

1 "Now the remarkable thing about the church order in the Didache is that it is equally objectionable both from the orthodox and the Montanist standpoint. It represents a system in which Prophets and Teachers are (after Apostles) the most important persons in the church; but it represents that system as in a state of break-down." B.H. Streeter, "The Much-Belaboured Didache," p. 373. Parentheses and italics Streeter's. Thus also R. Knopf, Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, pp. 2, 3, 30, 31.

2 (A.F., pp. 307, 386, 387, 393.)

3 A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, p. 407. However the fact that the apostles preach to the twelve tribes in Hermes, Similitude, IX 17.4 raises the possibility that the author denotes the Twelve and 28 teachers, in his reference to the 40 apostles and teachers that form the foundation of the church, Hermes, Similitude IX 15.4; 16.5. Thus E. Meyer, op. cit., I, 271.

4 J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 99, 100.

5 Irenaeus, Contra Haereses, Lib. II. 21.1 (P.G., VII 779, 780).

6 Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem, Lib. IV. 24 (P.L., II, 418, 419.).

7 Clement of Alexandria, Stromatum, Lib. II, 6,7; IV. 17 (P.G., VIII, 965, 969, 1312).

8 Origen, Comment in Joan., Tomus XXXII (P.G., XIV 785, 788.).

and Eusebius commenting on I Cor. 15.7 mentions "numberless apostles" besides the Twelve.¹

The complexity of this evidence demands that extreme caution be exercised while locating trends in the post-New Testament usage of ἀπόστολος. Even granting that the word becomes increasingly synonymous of the Twelve there are these significant exceptions. There is also the possibility that other factors besides the effect of Paul's apostolic consciousness govern the application of the term in the later Gentile church. Wagenmann observes that the concept of the apostolic faith, which becomes prominent in the second century alongside apostolic ministry and apostolic canon, emphasizes the importance of the Twelve at the expense of Paul. As the actual eye-witnesses and companions of Christ they alone are the reliable sources of his message and they alone lend authority to the teaching of the church.² This is especially evident in the Apologists and anti-heretical writers. For Justin the Twelve have faithfully communicated the message of Jesus throughout the world. They have disclosed the meaning of Old Testament prophecy, given true instruction upon the Sacraments, and accurately recorded Jesus' teaching in their writings.³ Even Irenaeus with his high opinion of Paul can limit the ἀπόστολοι to the Twelve when he considers the ground and authority

1 κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν δέδεκα πλεόντων ὅσων ὑπαρχάντων ἀποστόλων, Eusebius, Historiae Ecclesiasticae, I.12 (P.G., XX, 117, 119.).

2 J. Wagenmann, op. cit., pp. 187-202; 2.8-220. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, II, 680.

3 Justin, Apologia, I. 39, 49, 50, 61, 66; Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo, LIII (P.G., VI, 592, 593, 388, 400, 401, 404, 420, 421, 428, 429.).

for the gospel of Jesus.¹ This tendency to place Paul in the stream rather than at the source of tradition is clearly illustrated by the *Epistula Apostolorum* which is generally traced to Asia Minor and dated between 140 and 160 A.D.² Here the original apostles are commissioned to guide and instruct Paul, a preacher to the Gentiles, and to communicate to him the teaching they have received from Christ.³

However, as Cullmann has observed, this distinction is implicit in the first application of ἀπόστολος in the church. "In early Christianity the word 'apostle' is used in two senses: in the wider sense it denotes simply an eyewitness of the resurrection of Christ, in the narrower sense a member of the group of the Twelve who must bear witness not only to Christ risen but also to Christ incarnate on earth."⁴ A personal physical companionship with Christ, beginning from his Baptism, is required of the apostle, according to the primitive Jerusalem Church, Acts 1.21-26. Though I Cor 15.3-5 implies that Paul recognizes the uniqueness of the Twelve in fulfilling this qualification, he

1 Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses*, III Praefatio (P.G. VII, 843, 844).

2 M.R. James, *op. cit.*, p. 485; E.J. Goodspeed, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-38.

3 Trans. from Ethiopic ms. by M.R. James, *op. cit.*, p. 496.

4 O. Cullmann, "The Tradition," *The Early Church*, p. 72; *Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr*, p. 216: It must be noted, however, that Cullmann's distinction is only valid for the ἀπόστολοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

obviously does not consider it necessary for the ἀπόστολος and regards his own experience of the resurrection as a valid link with the tradition of Jesus.¹ In other words he never uses ἀπόστολος in Cullmann's narrower sense as it is found in Acts 1.21-26. Nevertheless it is this Acts concept emphasizing the aptitude and reliability of the apostle which in the later Gentile church prevails over Paul's view of the sufficiency of a commission from the risen Christ.²

Therefore the application of ἀπόστολος in the later Gentile church is presupposed by the concept of the apostle in the earliest days of Christianity, notwithstanding the significant contribution of Paul to this development. His earnest desire to be included among the apostles gives a certain prestige and currency to the term but as an alternative designation for the Twelve originating in the commission of Christ, ἀπόστολος was significant from the beginning. Moreover, Paul's particular apostolic consciousness is mistakenly referred to the Twelve by the Gentile church but it must still be recognised that Christ gave to the first apostles the perspective of a world mission.

1 Cf. Extended Note 1, pp. 128-129; p. 92, nt. 2; Cf. also T.W. Manson, The Church's Ministry, p. 50; G. Sass, op. cit., p. 34.

2 A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, I, 402, 403. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, II, 683-685 observes the connection between the increased interest in apostolic doctrine and the ascendancy of the Twelve in the later books of the New Testament. For the combination of these two factors in early non-canonical works vide the alternate title of the Didache, ΔΙΔΑΧΗ Κυρίου τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, (A.F., p. 217); Barnabas 8.3, (A.F., p. 252); Apocalypse of Peter D, M.R. James, op. cit., p. 511; Papias III 3,4,15, Eusebius, H.E., III 39, (A.F., pp. 527-529).

Finally as the later Gentile church concentrates upon a common apostolic teaching to meet the threat of unbelief without and heresy within, there is an increased tendency to connect the apostles with the Twelve. The earthly companions of Jesus become the only reliable sources for his gospel. Paul's emphasis upon the authority of Christ's commission is by-passed. Nevertheless this later development also has its roots in the early church: The task committed to the Twelve included the communication of his teaching, διδασκοντες αὐτοῖς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν, Mt. 28.20; the primitive Jerusalem church recognised the importance of discipleship for the apostle, Acts 1.21-26; and Paul's lack of association with Jesus was a principal argument against his demand for equality, I Cor. 15.8-10; II Cor. 5.16; Gal. 2.6.

However, despite these connections at almost every point it must still be noted that in one decisive respect the later Gentile church lost the perspective of the ἀπόστολοι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The consciousness which Paul shared with the Twelve of being commissioned for the interval between the resurrection and parousia is soon forgotten.

VIII

Extended Notes

1. This is generally accepted on the basis of παρέδοκα and παρέλαβον, vs. 3, which have been identified as official Jewish terms for reception and transmission of tradition. Cf. W.D. Davies, op. cit., pp. 248f., M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, trans. by B.L. Woolf, pp. 21f. J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. by A. Ehrhardt, pp. 129f. has contributed strong support to this view in a linguistic analysis of the passage where he indicates several un-Pauline words and phrases and finds a number of signs that suggest translation from a Semitic original. This approach to I Cor. 15.3-7 raises two principal critical questions: (1) From whom did Paul receive the tradition? (2) How can we reconcile this reception with the statement of Gal. 1.12, where Paul says of his gospel, "For I did not receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ."

The customary answer to the first problem is that this formula was given to Paul on the occasion of his first visit to Jerusalem, Gal. 1.18,19, by Peter. Thus C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments; J.G. Machen, op. cit., p. 145. However A.M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, p. 16 argues effectively that the passage has the character of a catechism and was therefore not likely to have been communicated in ordinary conversation. He suggests that Paul is reproducing here the baptismal creed of the Damascus Church, probably taught him by Ananias. Cf. also M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, p. 18. S.J. Case, "Paul's Historical Relation to the First Disciples," American Journal of Theology, XI (1907), 283f. lists eight instances prior to the Corinthian correspondence where Paul had intimate contact with the primitive church and might have received material from them.

The usual approach to the second question is to assert that Paul is speaking of two aspects of the same subject. Thus J.N. Sanders, "Peter and Paul in the Acts," New Testament Studies, II (1955,56), 134 distinguishes between the words concerning Jesus heard by Paul before his conversion and the truth about Christ which he accepts at Damascus. Similarly William Baird, "What is the Kerygma? A Study of I Cor. 15.3-8 and Gal. 1.11-17," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (1957), 190 differentiates between the form of the kerugma which Paul could have received as tradition from the Jerusalem church and the essentially dynamic nature of the gospel which could not be transmitted by men but was communicated by divine revelation. These distinctions are valid for interpreting the religious experience of anyone who sees a difference between the hearing and accepting of the gospel. But their weakness is that they fail to recognize that both I Cor. 15.3-7 and Gal. 1.11-17 are directly concerned with the unique role of the apostle. The resurrection appearance granted to Paul, which constitutes for him a divine call to apostleship, I Cor. 15.8-9; Gal. 1.15-17 is also his essential link with the tradition so that he is no more able to distinguish between

tradition and revelation than between the historical Jesus and the risen Christ. "Our conclusion is that the resolution of the difference between Paul's claim to have received the gospel directly from the Lord and the fact established in our first section that he received ~~μπαδδωτικ~~ from others consists in the belief that the exalted Christ himself stands as transmitter behind the apostles who transmit his words and works. Paul can place on the same level the revelation on the road to Damascus and the apostolic tradition he has received because in both Christ is directly at work." O. Cullmann, "The Tradition," p. 69. Cf. also H. Riesenfeld, The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings, pp. 19f.

2. J. Jeremias, op. cit., p. 129 following A. Harnack, "Die Verklaerungsgeschichte Jesu, der Bericht des Paulus, und die beiden Christus-Visionen des Petrus," Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (1922), pp. 62-80 (cited by Jeremias) believes that the primitive kerugma concludes with the appearance to the Twelve in vs. 5. This is indicated syntactically by the dependent clauses with ὅτι that are used through vs. 5, whereas the material following is expressed in main clauses. Harnack added to this evidence the parallelism between the appearance to Peter and the Twelve in vs. 5, and James and all the apostles, in vs. 7. On these grounds he believed that I Cor. 15.3-7 was presenting the rival traditions of two opposing groups within the early church, one promoting the primacy of Peter and the other of James. Paul simply reported the material but maintained a neutral attitude in the dispute. G. Sass, op. cit., pp. 97f., 132f. accepting this analysis, gives it a geographical orientation by locating the ministry of Peter and the Twelve in Galilee, while James and all the apostles are stationed in Jerusalem. M. Goguel, La Foi à la Resurrection de Jesus dans le Christianisme Primitif, pp. 250f. has advanced convincing arguments against these views: (1) Harnack's position offers no adequate explanation for the appearance to the 500 brethren in vs. 6. (2) The traditions Harnack indicates have no polemic character whatsoever. There is no claim included in either that Christ appeared first and exclusively to the one group as opposed to the other. (3) It would have been impossible for Paul not to declare himself in facing a controversy of such magnitude.

Furthermore the observation of R.H. Lightfoot, Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels, p. 50 on I Cor. 15, "Our earliest literary evidence seems to be indifferent to questions of locality.", underscores the weakness of Sass' geographical interpretation. Cf. also F.C. Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, pp. 53-97 esp. pp. 78, 89. The most probable solution to this question is given by C.H. Dodd, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels," Studies in the Gospels, ed. D.E. Nineham, p. 28. Dodd accepts the possibility that I Cor. 15.3-7 represents material combined from different sources but maintains that such sources had probably been welded into one commonly accepted tradition sometime before Paul had obtained them.

3. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, 359, 360. Cf. also J.S. Stewart, op. cit., pp. 125, 126. It is obvious from Ro. 1.4; 8.34; I Cor. 15.34-44; Phil. 2.9-11 that Paul regards Christ's ascension to the heavenly glory as contemporaneous with the resurrection. The appearances of Christ in I Cor. 15.3ff. can therefore be considered of the same character as his own, namely post-resurrection and post-ascension. J.G. Davies, He Ascended Into Heaven, pp. 49f. This raises the question of the significance of the ascension in Acts 1.9-11. J. Knox, op. cit., pp. 119f. believes that the ascension was inserted by the later church to materialize the resurrection appearances in order to meet an apologetic need. Cf. also M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, pp. 60ff. For K. Lake, "The Ascension," The Beginnings of Christianity, V, pp. 16ff, the ascension meets the theological need for solving the problem of the relationship between the dead body of Jesus on the cross and the risen Christ who appeared to the apostles.

In contrast to the views of Knox, Goguel and Lake, W. Michaelis, Die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen, pp. 86f. has shown that Acts 1.9-11 does not justify our interpreting the ascension as a unique event. Rather all the manifestations of the risen Christ begin with his coming from glory and conclude with his return or ascension to the Father. The whole New Testament witnesses the appearances of "one already present with God in the heavenly glory." Ibid., p. 86. Cf. Mt. 28.10; Mk. 16.10; Jn. 20.17-21.1 and esp. the seeming contradiction of the ascension from Bethany, Lk. 24.50, 51. Therefore the Acts 1.9-11 is consistent with the basic orientation of I Cor. 15.8, where all of Christ's appearances follow the ascension as well as the resurrection. Nevertheless it probably depicts what was believed in the early church to be the concluding revelation. "The account of the Ascension in Acts would therefore not mean that Jesus had not returned to his Father, but that the period of his manifestations to the disciples being over, he disappeared definitively from their eyes." R. Russell, "Modern Exegesis and the Fact of the Resurrection," The Downside Review, LXXVI (1958), 329-343. Cf. also P. Benoit, "L'Ascension," Revue Biblique, LVI (1949), pp. 198-203; F.F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, pp. 39, 40.

4. K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, pp. 154ff. presents a formidable argument for the identification of II Cor. 10 - 13 with the so-called severe letter to which Paul refers in II Cor. 2.4; 7.8. Lake challenges anyone who seeks to maintain the unity of the Epistle to explain the sudden change of tone between chaps. 9 and 10 as well as the numerous cross references, where conditions alluded to in the past tense in chaps. 1-9 are rendered with the present in 10-13. This argument first propounded in English by J.H. Kennedy, The Second and Third Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians,

pp. 79ff., has been expanded by A. Plummer, Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, pp. XXVIIff. and R.H. Strachan, The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, M.N.T.C., pp. XVff. The principal arguments against this view are: (1) the total absence of ms. evidence; (2) the fact that chaps. 1-9 reflect an internal struggle within the community whereas 10-13 are concerned with the relation of the community to intruders, the *ψευδαπόστολοι* of 11.13 (3) the lack of any mention in 10-13 of the discipline of the wayward member referred to in 2.5-11; 7.11, 12, J. Munck, P.H., pp. 163ff; W. Bousset, Der zweite Brief an die Korinther, pp. 166f. The last factor forces the adherents of this view to hold that chaps. 10-13 are only a fragment of the severe letter, which raises the final objection (4) of the improbability of ancient mss. being combined in this manner. M. Dibelius, A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature, no trans., p. 154.

In the face of so many complex factors the view of J. Munck, loc. cit., and Hans Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief, pp. 12ff. seems to provide the best explanation. Chaps. 10-13 represent Paul's reaction to subsequent news of the intensifying of the conflict in Corinth through the influence of the *ψευδαπόστολοι*. This accounts for the change of tone between chaps. 9 and 10 as well as the internal connections. In Chaps. 1-9 we have the past tense of the former conflict and in 10-13 the present tense of the immediate crisis. Though the cause of tension differs, many of the issues remain, e.g. the Corinthians' acknowledgement of Paul's apostolic authority. Either the news was received in time for Paul himself to append this urgent personal note, *Ἀλλὰ ὁ ἐγὼ Παῦλος παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς*, 10.1 and dispatch the letter as a whole or else chaps. 10-13 arrived in Corinth soon enough after chaps. 1-9 to be naturally combined with them for safe keeping.

5. B.S. Easton, op. cit., pp. 19f.; J. Knox, op. cit., pp. 27, 28, 117, 118 have asserted that Luke regards Paul as a second class apostle inferior to the Twelve, and base this contention upon Acts 13.1f., and Acts 1.21,22 where the requirements that are essential for apostolic office exclude Paul. Thus also J. Wagenmann, op. cit., pp. 76-79. However a more probable explanation for these difficulties arises from the literary analysis of Acts. A. Harnack, The Acts of the Apostles, trans. J.R. Wilkinson, pp. 162-202 assigns Acts 1.21,22 to the tradition of the Jerusalem church and Acts 13.1 - 14.28 to Antioch. Though Jackson and Lake question the form in which the Acts material was communicated, admitting the possibility of oral transmission and Aramaic documents, they support Harnack's conclusions over the location of the tradition. F.J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, "The Internal Evidence of Acts," The Beginnings of Christianity, II 139-153. There is still general agreement over Harnack's locations and the present debate centers primarily upon the division and form of the sources and their composition in relation to the third Gospel. J. Jeremias, "Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte," Z.N.W., XXXVI (1937), 208-215. A.H. McNeile, An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, pp. 81-95; C.S.C. Williams, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles,

B.N.T.C., pp. 7-13. Thus there is a strong likelihood that in Acts 1.21,22 we have the viewpoint of the early Jerusalem community and in Acts 13.1 - 14.28 the opinion concerning Paul that prevailed at Antioch.

However Acts makes Luke's own conviction equally apparent. J. Munck, P.H., p. 25 has argued convincingly from Acts 9.7; 22.14; 26.16 that the author of Acts believed Paul to have seen the risen Christ, and K. Lake, "The Twelve and the Apostles," The Beginnings of Christianity, V, 52 states that the stress upon Paul's call and commission is an obvious attempt to coordinate his experience with that of the original apostles. The representation of Acts 1.9-11 as a final appearance of Christ, and the view of the resurrection attributed to Paul in Acts 13.30,31 (prompting K. Holl, op. cit., p. 62 to remark that it is difficult to believe that a companion of Paul's wrote Acts) therefore reveal Luke's integrity in reproducing his sources but do not necessarily constitute his own personal perspective. This perspective is apparent in his interpretation of the Damascus experience as a call from the risen Christ, and his obvious conviction that Paul's ministry exhibits the "signs of an apostle", II Cor. 12.12. Paul has the power to confer the Holy Spirit, Acts 19.1-7, which in Acts 8.14-19 is a rite reserved exclusively to the apostles. H.J. Cadbury, The Book of Acts in History, p. 131, observing this remarkable concurrence between the roles of Peter and Paul in Acts states, "For the author they were in fact and in thought parallel." Perhaps the most significant consideration, however, is the fact that Paul by taking the gospel to Rome, Acts 28.14-31, fulfills in Luke's mind the commission that is given to the apostles, Acts 1.8.

6. J. Munck, P.A.T., pp. 109,110; P.H., p. 275, believes that Mt. 28.18-20 represents the interpretation of the Twelve that prevailed in the later Gentile church. In actuality the Twelve were directed by Christ to confine their mission to the Jews, Mt. 10.5,23. They were to remain in Jerusalem until the Jews had been converted, and only then would the Gentiles turn to Christ, P.H., pp. 251, 266-268, 271. Munck is mistaken however to base his understanding of the later vocational consciousness of the Twelve upon the delegations of authority in Mt. 10.5,23 which as we have seen only apply to a specific period of Jesus' ministry, Mk. 6.30; Lk. 9.10, A. Fridrichsen, A.M., p. 6. The commission of the risen Christ following the completion of his redemptive activity gives a totally new dimension to the task of the Twelve. "Hence the implication of Mt. 28.18-20 is that with the death and resurrection of Jesus the eschatological hour has arrived. God no longer limits his saving grace to Israel, but turns in mercy to the whole Gentile world. Henceforth the eschatological people of God are to announce to all nations that they too belong to the Kingdom of the Son of Man." J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, trans. by S.H. Hooke, p. 39. Cf. also the view of Jn. 12.20f. presented by O. Cullmann, "Samaria and the Origins of the

Christian Mission", The Early Church, pp. 186, 187; W.G. Kümmel, "Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche", Studia Theologica, VII - VIII (1953-54) 26, 27. For this same reason we cannot concur with H. Riesenfeld, "The Ministry in the New Testament", The Root of the Vine, ed. A.G. Hebert, pp. 110-120 when he identifies the work of the apostles with the ministry which Jesus performs on earth. Though the apostles are Christ's representatives and act in his authority, the commission which they are given following the resurrection commits them to a unique work which is the effect and not the equivalent of the ministry of Jesus. Cf. O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, pp. 215f.

PART THREE

PAUL'S MISSION AND THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY

I

A Summary of the Views of Fridrichsen, Munck, and Cullmann
on Paul's Mission

Important differences distinguish the interpretations which Fridrichsen and Munck give to Paul's mission, but both scholars proceed logically from their view of his exclusive eschatological apostolate. Fridrichsen accepts the accounts in Acts which describe the initial spread of Christianity to Judaea, Galilee, and Syria and believes that at an early date there were churches in Alexandria and Rome. However within this broad perspective of the dispersion of the new faith, he finds no mission that is considered of significance for the eschatological chain of events apart from the work of Peter and Paul.¹

This viewpoint clearly underlies the report of the agreement which Paul reaches with Peter in Gal. 2.7,8. "Obviously Paul pictures to himself the eschatological situation of the world in this way: In the world soon disappearing, the centre is Jerusalem with the primitive community and the Twelve, surrounded by the mission field divided between two apostles: one sent by the Lord to the circumcised, the other to the Gentiles."² The agreement presupposes that Peter has been called not only to preach the gospel to Jews in the Jewish world but also to supervise the work of others who have been entrusted with the

1 A. Fridrichsen, A.M., pp. 5,6.

2 Ibid., p. 6.

Jewish mission. Many beside Paul are also involved in the Gentile mission. Though he does not encroach upon their work or seek to dominate the communities which they found, still he feels himself responsible for the whole Gentile ministry and he attempts to assert his influence over the entire area.¹

Into this framework of a two-fold mission in the early church, Fridrichsen fits his unique view that Peter and Paul are each equipped with a special gospel to fulfill their individual responsibilities. I Cor. 15.3ff demonstrates that both Apostles base their message of a common Christological kerugma but nevertheless there is an important difference in the interpretation of Christ's death and resurrection. For Peter the risen Christ rules over the new-covenant community which is formed of all Jews who accept Jesus as the crucified and exalted Messiah. His gospel is based upon the priority of Israel as the chosen people, experiencing now in Christ the fulfillment of God's promises. Though Peter expects the conversion of the Gentiles, he feels no constraint to extend the church's mission to the pagan world. Rather the Gentiles will be brought into the kingdom through God's own act of salvation when the parousia of Christ initiates the final series of eschatological events.²

1 Ibid., pp. 7,8. Fridrichsen believes that Ephesians represents the type of letter Paul wrote to churches which he had not himself founded. Similarly the object of Romans is "to assert in a discreet way, the apostolic authority and teaching of Paul in the church of Rome." Ro. 1.5; II Cor. 2.14; Col. 1.23 are all cited by Fridrichsen in this connection, loc. cit.

2 Ibid., pp. 8,9,19.

For Paul the resurrection signifies that Christ has become Lord and Saviour of the universe. The new Israel is not restricted to Jews but is accessible to all men now through faith. It is this special interpretation of the basic kerugma that Paul submits for the judgment of the "pillars" in Gal. 2.1ff. Recognising the genuine results of his mission, they perceive that he has been called and equipped by God with the gospel for the uncircumcision. This leads to a geographical division of the field where Peter assumes responsibility for the work in Palestine and Paul goes to the world beyond.¹ In Paul's opinion the Jewish church under Peter has no place outside of Palestine. Peter's gospel, though based on a common tradition, invariably leads to the demand for circumcision and the fulfilling of the Law when it is preached to Gentiles, and Paul considers these requirements abolished in Christ. Nevertheless Fridrichsen insists that Peter is no Judaiser. "He had wholeheartedly approved the apostolate and gospel of Paul. But he belonged to the Jews -- and they were probably the majority -- who were not able to draw the consequences of the admission of the Gentiles to the Church of Christ as regards the interrelations between Christians of the circumcision and such of the uncircumcision outside of Palestine."²

1 Ibid., pp. 9-12, 22. According to Fridrichsen Gal. 2.7-9 could not represent an ethnic division since it is obvious from Ro. 1.13ff.; I Cor. 9.20 and the accounts of the Pauline mission in Acts that Paul is also sent to the Jews. Probably his early mission in Arabia and Damascus is confined to Jews and occasions serious reflection over the admission of Gentiles to Christianity on equal terms. Sometime later he receives a direct summons to be an apostle to the Gentiles and it is possible that the temple vision of Acts 22.17-21 reflects this special call. Ibid., pp. 12, 13, 23.

2 Ibid., p. 13; pp. 11, 22.

In contrast to Fridrichsen, Munck believes that from the beginning the leaders of the primitive Christian community preach Christ as Messiah, crucified and risen for all men. Nevertheless they have been directed by the Lord to remain in Jerusalem and to restrict their mission to the Jews. This focal point of Jewish faith seems to the Twelve an ideal location from which to spread the gospel throughout the diaspora and thus procure the conversion of Israel. They regard this conversion as the first and decisive event of the Heilsgeschichte which in turn will give rise to the salvation of the Gentiles.¹ In addition to the Twelve and James conducting the Jewish mission in Jerusalem, numerous apostles (besides Paul) are sent by the risen Christ to the Gentiles and with other missionaries and individual believers they found Christian communities such as Antioch and Rome. But out of its basic conviction that Israel must be won before the Gentiles can receive salvation, the Jerusalem church pays no particular regard to these communities and does not attempt to impose its authority upon them. "Therefore the Gentile mission begun by Paul and others can scarcely raise special interest among the Jewish Christians; to them this must appear as a laborious and superfluous detour. According to their view the gospel ought to be preached to Israel and then the Gentiles will be ready as a ripe fruit for the harvest."²

1 J. Munck, P.H., pp. 63, 205-208, 229, 253f., 267f.

2 Ibid., p. 239; also pp. 96f., 202f., 227, 250-253.

In Gal. 2.7-10 we have not only a meeting of representatives from these Jewish and Gentile missions but also the emergence of the two apostolates with a decisive significance for the final salvation events, namely Peter's to the circumcision, and Paul's to the uncircumcision. The central issue of the conference does not however concern the divergence between the Petrine and Pauline gospels as Fridrichsen holds, but rather involves the eschatological perspectives which underlie the two missions.¹ Paul knows himself called to preach the gospel to the world and his work will culminate in "The Fullness of the Gentiles". But although the Jews have rejected Christ and the message of the apostles, Paul has by no means eliminated the conversion of Israel. Rather the Gentiles' acceptance of the gospel arouses the jealousy of the Jews and this shall become the means to their final salvation at the end of time. Under divine direction Paul goes to Jerusalem to seek recognition of his apostolate from the leaders of the Jewish mission, to convince them that his own work relates to theirs since it is also intent upon the salvation of Israel, and to persuade them to assume responsibility for the Jews of the eastern diaspora so that he himself

1 *Ibid.*, pp. 53-56, 111-113. Munck insists that the Jerusalem church had no Judaizing outlook. From the beginning the belief in Jesus as Messiah and the observance of the sacraments distinguished the Christian community from unbelieving Jews. The Jewish reaction was to persecute the faith. There is absolutely no evidence that the Jerusalem church made circumcision and law observance requirements for entry into the Christian fellowship or that they delegated authorized representatives to impress a Judaistic gospel upon the Gentile communities. Only in Galatia does a Judaistic movement arise and there it is confined to Gentile Christians and has no relation to Jerusalem whatsoever, pp. 75-78, 95-97, 204-212, 225, 226, 237-241.

will be free to go to the world beyond.¹

At the conference, Gal. 2.1-10, Paul achieves all of these objectives. There is a geographical division of the mission field, where Peter and the others agree to go outside of Jerusalem and extend their mission to the Jews in Palestine, Syria, Cilicia, Mesopotamia and Egypt, while Paul concentrates upon the Gentiles in the rest of the Roman Empire. Peter sends Paul to his field just as Paul sends Peter to the Jews, and each understands the other's work. The agreement is therefore an expression of unity. This is especially true on Paul's side since he views the mission under Peter and the resulting rejection of the gospel by the Jews as a decisive factor for his present ministry to the Gentiles and the ultimate salvation of Israel. On Peter's side the gospel is believed to have universal application and therefore Paul's mission can be accepted, but beyond this the Jerusalem leaders assume no active interest or share in Paul's work owing to their continued conviction that the time for preaching to the Gentiles will only be ripe when Israel is won to Christ. To them the agreement expresses this difference in eschatological outlook. Each side is allowed to pursue independently its own particular concept of the sequence of salvation events. "This diversity in the interpretation of the mission comes outwardly to expression in the division of the work into the mission to the Jews under Peter and the mission to

¹ Ibid., pp. 37-39, 85-87, 100, 101, 111-114, also J. Munck, "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament," J.T.S., II (1951), 9-11.

the Gentiles under Paul."¹ The agreement lasts until Paul's death.²

In the Epistle to the Romans there are two passages which reveal the outcome of the arrangement adopted at the Jerusalem conference, Gal. 2.1-10. (1) Ro. 10.14-21 indicates that the Jewish mission under Peter is completed and that its only result has been to harden the Jews to the gospel. Not every Jew in the territory assigned to Peter has been reached, but the negative response of those who have is representative of Israel's collective rejection of Christ.

From (2) Ro. 15.17-24, it is evident that an important phase of Paul's work is also concluded. The Gentile mission has proceeded from Jerusalem to Illyricum and Paul is now free to turn his attention to Rome and the westward regions of the Empire. As with the Jewish mission, Paul has not preached to each Gentile in this vast area, nor has he sought to establish Christianity in strategic locations which would facilitate its spread to every corner of his field. Rather through what Munck designates a "representative universalism", the response of the few is valid for all.³ But in contrast to the Jewish mission this response has been positive. "The Apostle Peter and the others, who were sent by Christ to preach to the Jews had therefore returned without results. But it had gone altogether

¹ J. Munck, P.H., p. 271; also 85-87, 111-114, 226-232, 268-276.

² Ibid., pp. 232, 274.

³ Ibid., p. 273; also 41-48, 201-202, 271-273; J. Munck, C.I., pp. 73-76.

differently among the Gentiles. Here salvation was attained as a result of Israel's rejection of the gospel. And Paul looked forward to 'The Fullness of the Gentiles', which was to give the sign for the conversion of Israel."¹

Ro. 15.17-24 also reveals Paul's determination to go to Jerusalem with the offering for the saints before beginning his mission in the West. Munck rejects Holl's argument that this offering constitutes a tribute which Jerusalem levies from Paul's churches. Furthermore the fact that Paul himself feels compelled to assume the risks of the trip and that he organizes a large delegation of representatives from his communities is not sufficiently explained by interpreting the collection as an ecumenical gesture. According to Munck Paul sees it rather as the fulfillment of the O.T. prophecies which relate to the conversion of the Gentiles and which describe the nations bearing their gifts and streaming to Mt. Zion. Paul hopes that the delegates from his churches will become "The Fullness of the Gentiles" in Jerusalem, and that this in turn will arouse the jealousy of the Jews and occasion the salvation of Israel, Ro. 9.1ff, 25, 26; 10.10.²

Paul's plan to precipitate the final salvation events is frustrated by his own arrest, trial, detention at Caesarea, appeal to Caesar, and subsequent imprisonment in Rome. These circumstances are bitterly disappointing since his mission to

1 J. Munck, P.H., p. 295.

2 Ibid., pp. 282-302; J. Munck, C.I., pp. 16-18, 58, 69.

the west is thereby thwarted and the return of Christ delayed. But eventually Paul sees that his witness before Caesar represents a preaching to the nations, Mt. 10.18-20; Mk. 13.9-11; II Tim. 4.16-18. God's plan is not defeated by the imprisonment of the Apostle but precisely through this will "The Fullness of the Gentiles" be realised and the salvation of Israel assured. Therefore as Paul faces death at Rome, he looks as well for the imminent coming of Christ.¹

For Cullmann's interpretation of the mission of the early church we are dependent upon a number of his separate contributions to New Testament research. The resulting position is similar to his treatment of the *ἀποστολος* in that he does not proceed directly from the unique eschatological perspective which he attributes to Paul, and therefore more nearly approximates traditional views of the spread of Christianity than do Munck and Fridrichsen. Cullmann believes that the Twelve receive from Jesus the responsibility for the Gentile mission and that the church generally recognises the necessity of preaching to the nations before the End. The conversion of the Samaritans represents the beginning of mission activity and demonstrates that all missionary work was at first considered dependent upon Jerusalem. With the conversion of Cornelius the actual mission to the Gentiles is inaugurated by Peter.²

1 J. Munck, P.H., pp. 303-329.

2 O. Cullmann, "Samaria and Origins of the Christian Mission," The Early Church, pp. 185-187; C.E., pp. 229-235; Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, pp. 35-37.

Following his imprisonment, Acts 12.17, Peter devotes himself entirely to the leadership of the Jewish Christian mission leaving the administration of the Jerusalem church to James. Meanwhile Paul along with Barnabas has independently organized a mission to the Gentiles. With the agreement of Gal. 2.1-10, Acts 15.1ff. the ministries of Paul and Peter are established as two separate missionary organizations, and although this negotiation is conducted in a peaceful way, it still represents a decisive split in the church. The Jerusalem church maintains a direct connection with the Jewish Christian mission under Peter, but renounces its claim to supervise Paul's Gentile mission and thus gives the highest possible recognition to his apostolate. However Paul is still loosely tied to Jerusalem by the stipulation of the collection. Just as the temple tax was an outward sign of the unity of the Jews dispersed throughout the Empire so the offering of Paul's Gentile communities manifests the unity of the church.¹

The main difficulty with the Jerusalem agreement is that it fails to consider communities of mixed membership. The presence of Jewish Christians in Gentile areas theoretically justifies the attempts of the Jerusalem group to extend their influence into Paul's churches. Paul deeply resents this interference, and, though the existence of Gentiles in Jewish communities gives him a similar opening, he refuses, as a matter of

1 O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, pp. 37-44.

honour to intrude upon the work of others, Ro. 15.20.¹ The tension between the Gentile and Jewish missions is further aggravated by the discussion over circumcision which does not lead to a commonly shared conviction but rather results in a basic "unbridged difference" in the conception of grace. The echoes of all this debate can be traced in Paul's Epistles. Cullmann emphasizes however that throughout this period Peter's sympathies were more with Paul than with James and that Peter stood closer to Paul in outlook than did his colleagues in the Jewish Christian mission.²

From this summary it is evident that there is great divergence in the respective interpretations which Fridrichsen, Munck, and Cullmann give to Paul's mission. Nevertheless one obvious characteristic unites the three views: Each is based upon an analysis of the agreement which Paul describes in Gal. 2.7-10. The significance of this agreement in both the Epistle to the Galatians and the book of Acts confirms the advisability of such an approach. It is the account of this conference of the Christian leaders that provides a key for determining Paul's perspective of the church's mission, his evaluation of the work of others in the context of his own responsibility, his concept of strategy, his objectives, his vision of the fulfilled task. Accordingly the positions of

1 Cullmann cites Paul's appeal to Rome for support in the mission to the west as the one exception to this policy of non-intervention, Ibid., p. 45.

2 Ibid., pp. 44-55.

Fridrichsen, Munck, and Cullmann can be seen most clearly and evaluated most effectively from the standpoint of this crucial meeting in Jerusalem.

II

Galatians 2.7-9 as a Division of Gospel

Analyzing the distinctions which Paul makes between τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς περιτομῆς and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας in Gal. 2.7 and between an ἀποστολὴ τῆς περιτομῆς and ἀποστολὴ τῶν ἔθνων in verse 8, Jeremias remarks that these expressions can be understood (1) ethnographically, (2) geographically or as (3) referring to the content of the gospel.¹

Fridrichsen sees the Jerusalem agreement primarily in terms of this last category. Paul is to be distinguished from Peter not only by his mission to the Gentiles but by the special gospel with which he is equipped to carry on his work. Fridrichsen's view has the advantage of discerning that the validity of Paul's gospel is the central issue of the meeting.² Paul establishes this in vs. 2 when he states the object of his journey to Jerusalem, καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

1 J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, p. 24.

2 Thus A. Loisy, op. cit., pp. 143-145; A. Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, trans. A.M. Hellier, pp. 125, 126.

Furthermore the fact that the circumcision of Titus is made a test case, vss. 3-5, demonstrates that the Jerusalem community questioned whether Paul's gospel of faith in Christ was sufficient in itself to procure the salvation of the Gentiles.¹

Fridrichsen's position fails to perceive however that Paul's gospel is accepted without reservation at the conference. Not only does Paul submit his Gentile preaching for general examination but he also engages in discussions with the leading apostles, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, μὴ πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον.² The crucial importance which he attaches to these private meetings is revealed by this usage of the runner image, which, as we have seen, defines Paul's basic vocational perspective.³ He knows himself to be an apostle, one of the group whom God has

1 It is impossible from the text to determine whether Titus was actually circumcised or not. The discussion revolves around two exegetical points: (1) Paul insists that Titus was not compelled to be circumcised, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Τίτος ... ἡναγκάσθη περιτεμεῖσθαι, vs. 3, but this could mean that Titus submitted of his own free will. (2) Paul claims that he did not yield for an hour οἷς οὐδὲ πρὸς ὧραν εἰξάμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ vs. 5, but D* omits οἷς οὐδὲ and therefore conveys precisely the opposite meaning. Though D* in itself is by no means decisive, we have difficulty accounting for this awkward reading without accepting its originality. The argument from context is no more conclusive. The view of E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, p. 81 that Paul would hardly have surrendered on the point that represents the key to the whole controversy is to be favored. But, as J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, pp. 270-272 remarks, it is impossible to keep Paul consistent and if he had decided to yield in a question of practice in order to gain recognition for the more important principle, he would undoubtedly have been forced, by his opposition to justify the move. Cf. also J. Munck, P.H., pp. 87f. who opposes Titus' being circumcised and G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, pp. 41-48 who argues for its admission.

2 Vide. Extended Note 1 at the end of Part Three.

3 Cf. above, pp. 52-55, 66-69.

commissioned for the interval between the resurrection and parousia. For his gospel to be repudiated by the best known members of this group would represent a fundamental contradiction in his consciousness of a divine call and in his concept of God's intention for the present time. His whole mission would be purposeless (εἰς κενόν). But Paul's statement in vs. 6 ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδέν προσανεθέοντο, as well as the offering of the right hand of fellowship in vs. 8 are surely presented as evidence that his gospel was confirmed, the unity of the apostolate preserved, and consequently the fruit of his work assured.

Furthermore the view of Fridrichsen that Peter's gospel when preached in a Gentile area results in an appeal for circumcision and Law observance, overlooks the fact that these demands are not made by the Jerusalem leaders but by those whom Paul designates ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, vs. 4. The situation is similar at Antioch, which Fridrichsen brings forward as evidence that Peter belonged to the majority of Jews who were unable to accept the inclusion of Gentiles as equals in the church.¹ However as Cullmann has shown, Paul can only accuse Peter of hypocrisy in Antioch, because Peter has departed from a principle to which they both give their assent.² The state-

1 A. Fridrichsen, A.M., pp. 12,13.

2 O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, p. 65; also J.G. Machen, op. cit., p. 102 who writes, "The passage, Gal. 2.11-21, therefore far from establishing a fundamental disagreement between Peter and Paul really furnishes the strongest possible evidence for their fundamental unity." Thus also E.F. Scott, The Beginnings of the Church, pp. 121-124.

ment of this common belief in vs. 16 makes Peter's convictions over the salvation of the Gentiles unmistakably clear, ἡμεῖς ...εἰδοτες δὲ ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμον ἔαν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ.¹ Therefore, though Peter's action at Antioch has the effect of laying conditions upon Gentile believers, it must be remembered that Paul considers this action inconsistent with Peter's declared position, and a capitulation to the radicals, φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς, vs. 12.

Thus Fridrichsen correctly observes the conflict between Paul and the Jerusalem Christians but he is surely mistaken to place Paul and Peter on opposite sides of the struggle for the admission of the Gentiles. His insistence that Peter was no Judaiser does not nullify the fact that he has fallen into Baur's error of drawing the line between the two apostles.² Since Baur, the broad stream of Pauline scholarship has

1 W. Bousset, op. cit., pp. 45,46; G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, p. 62; W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 123 offers the very likely suggestion that Peter and Paul came to agreement on this principle during their first encounter in Jerusalem, Gal. 1.18. Thus also C. Weizsäcker, op. cit., I, 97; W. Baird, op. cit., p. 190.

2 F.C. Baur, op. cit., I, 125 writes, "The question was by no means first agitated by mere individual, pharisaic-minded members of the Church at Jerusalem, we here see a conflict between the Pauline and Jewish Christianity." Later, Ibid., pp. 132, 133, Baur distinguishes between strict Jews who opposed Paul in both principle and practice and liberal Jews headed by the Jerusalem leaders who did not resist Paul's mission in practice after the Jerusalem conference, but continued to object in principle. However the Acts 15 account of Paul's struggles with a circumcision party of the Jerusalem church is to be rejected in favor of Gal. 2.1-10 which according to Baur confirms the fact that the dispute was basically between the apostles themselves, Ibid., p. 139.

recognised with Cullmann that Paul's opposition comes from a narrow right wing party of the Jerusalem community and that Peter assumes the role of a mediator whose personal sympathies are with Paul but whose overall object is to preserve the unity of the church. Cullmann's scheme groups James with the radicals but there is much justification in also assigning to him a tolerant acceptance of the Gentile mission, with the obvious reservation that his connections in Jerusalem place him in a less compromising position than Peter's.

The resulting perspective in the context of the conference is admirably summarized by Schoeps: "I come therefore to the conclusion that the handshake (according to Gal. 2.9) with which the ~~οὐλο~~ dismissed Paul from the Apostolic convention signified their sincere recognition (verse 7) of Paul's Gentile apostolate, that Paul was entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter was to the circumcised, that both men worked together and not against one another and James as the head of the community gave his blessing to this, much to the disgust of the intransigent zealots for the Law in the Jerusalem community."¹

The weakness of Fridrichsen's position is further exposed when we turn to I Cor. 15.3-11. His view that Peter and Paul base their gospels on a common kerugma but differ in their interpretations of the resurrection is complicated by the fact that this common kerugma includes an interpretation of the

1 Vide. Extended Note 2 at the end of Part Three.

resurrection, καὶ ὅτι ἐγγήρεται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς,
vs. 4. The work of Dodd and Hunter has demonstrated that Paul is not alone in his conception of Christ, the Saviour of mankind, who is raised and exalted by God over heaven and earth. These elements arise repeatedly in Peter's speeches in Acts, Acts 2.33-36; 3.20,21; 10.42 which perhaps do not convey his actual words but can confidently be taken to represent the early tradition of the Jerusalem church.¹ This makes it extremely unlikely that Peter's gospel would arouse demands for circumcision and Law observance when preached in a Gentile area. In fact Paul expressly states that the common kerugma whether preached by himself, Peter or any of the apostles, produces faith, εἴτε οὖν ἐγὼ εἴτε ἐκείνοι, οὕτως κηρύσσομεν καὶ οὕτως ἐπιστεύσατε, I Cor.15.11.

The distinction between τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς περιτομῆς and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, Gal. 2.7, therefore cannot refer to the actual content of the gospel. Nevertheless there undoubtedly existed a difference in the application of the gospel to the specific situation of Jews and Gentiles. There is no evidence that the Jews discontinued their observance of the Law when they entered the Christian faith, Ro. 3.31; 7.12; I Cor. 7.17-24; Acts 21.17-26, and we can accept Davies' judgement regarding Paul, "The Apostle who first turned to the Gentiles on the ground that salvation could be received apart from the Law, himself

1 C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, pp. 37-51; A.M. Hunter, The Unity of the New Testament, pp. 22-25; B. Reike, op. cit., pp. 159, 160; Cf. Extended Note 5, p.131.

lived and died 'a Pharisee'."¹

However the fact that the Jewish Christian leaders give unconditional approval to Paul's gospel demonstrates that adherence to the Law was not considered a requirement for salvation. Speaking of the primitive Jerusalem community Friedrich writes, "They have kept the Law as a natural order for life, without ascribing soteriological significance to it."² Thus there is a difference in that the presentation of the gospel to the Jews would include a recommendation to continue in the Law as a "Lebensordnung", whereas the Gentiles would be given unconditional freedom in Christ, $\tau\eta\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\iota\alpha\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma\ \eta\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon\upsilon$, Gal. 5.1, and, by Paul at least, specifically warned against the Law, Gal. 5.2,3. The weakness of this arrangement was its

1 W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 70; Cf. also J. Parkes, Jesus, Paul and the Jews, pp. 118ff.

2 G. Friedrich, "εὐαγγέλιον," T.W.N.T., II, 732; E. Hirsch, op. cit., pp. 69,70 writes, "In characterizing the position of James in Gal. 2.12, one may never forget Gal. 2.9 and Acts 15.21. James' main interest has not been the Judaistic in the sense of inducing the Gentile Christians to Circumcision, but exclusively the holding of Jewish Christians secure through faith in the Law; indeed he was given the commission of Christ to the Circumcised, Gal. 2.9. From this standpoint he has made all concessions, that were possible, provided the fellowship was to be preserved." Cf. also C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, pp. 41-46; M. Dibelius, W.G. Kümmel, Paul, pp. 37,38.

3 E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, p. 92. C. Weizsäcker, op. cit., I, 187; A. Schweitzer, op. cit., pp. 193-195 has rightly seen that the supernatural identification with Christ and the expectation of an imminent parousia are factors which influence Paul to encourage converts to continue in the natural state from which they entered the faith, though it is doubtful if this "theory of the status quo" was applied as rigidly by Paul as it is by Schweitzer. The Jewish belief that the Law would be better studied and better observed in the Messianic Age perhaps contributed to Paul's personal stand and occasioned his advising the Jews not to depart from their ethical tradition. Cf.

failure to foresee the problem of the mixed community where a Jew would find it impossible to participate and still maintain his consistency in the Law.¹

III

Galatians 2.7-9 as a Division of Mission

According to Jeremias, another possible interpretation of the distinctions in Gal. 2.7-9 is the ethnological one: Peter restricts his mission to Jews and Paul works among Gentiles. Fridrichsen, Munck and Cullmann do not deny that Peter and the Jerusalem group see the universal application of the gospel, but at the same time the three scholars each find an ethnological division in the agreement, Gal. 2.7-9. For Fridrichsen and Munck, Peter concentrates upon a mission to the Jews and envisions the salvation of the Gentiles in the future. As we

G.F. Moore, op. cit., I, 271, 272. However his main motivation in keeping the Law was undoubtedly to maintain his contact with Jews in order to win them to Christ, I Cor. 9.19,20 and also to foster a close relation between his own work and the Jewish Christian mission, provided the Jerusalem leaders recognised that the Law was inconsequential for salvation, Gal. 2.6-9. "The observance of the Law in short was Paul's passport with Judaism. Had he ceased to be faithful to the former, for example, such a meeting as that of the Council of Jerusalem would have been impossible, because a non-practicing Paul would not have been taken seriously." W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 74.

1 Vide. Extended Note 3 at the end of Part Three.

have noted Fridrichsen believes that this salvation was anticipated as an eschatological wonder performed by God at the End, whereas Munck holds that the original apostles expected the Gentiles to be won in the present age but only after the conversion of the Jews.

Fridrichsen's position has received its most powerful support from Jeremias who finds a reference to the "eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to the Mountain of God" in Jesus' words, λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἔξουσιν καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσοὺκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, Mt. 8.11.¹ Jeremias traces this idea through the O.T., the extra-canonical and Rabbinic literature, and interprets several other N.T. passages in the light of his research.²

Undoubtedly Jeremias has developed a valid Biblical concept but the weakness of this view is its failure to recognise that in the primitive church the anticipation of the future

1 J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, p. 57.

2 Ibid., pp. 55-73; B. Sundkler, "Jesus et les Païens," R.H.S.R., (1936), pp. 469-499 is very close to Jeremias' position. Rejecting the modern dialectic of particularism and universalism for interpreting the viewpoint of primitive Christianity, Sundkler sees Christ's coming to the Jews, cleansing of the Temple, and performance of the redemptive acts in Jerusalem, as a work intent upon the salvation of Israel since it is this salvation that is a light to the whole world. The original disciples remain in Jerusalem and like Jesus center their attention upon the Jews, looking to Christ's return as the time for the gathering of God's people everywhere.

gathering of God's people by no means conflicted with the sense of responsibility for a world mission. Indeed the remark, Mt. 8.11, which Jeremias has made a keystone of his argument is no detached pronouncement upon eschatological events but rather a commentary upon the faith with which a Gentile officer responds to Jesus, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, παρ' οὐδενὶ τοσούτου πιστεύει ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ εὐδρον, Mt. 8.10. In other words, here as elsewhere, Jesus seems to connect the future gathering of Gentiles to the present faith of Gentiles, Mt. 25.23, 31-36; Lk. 8.16-18; Jn. 10.16.

Furthermore Jeremias is particularly vulnerable in interpreting two Synoptic concepts which are vital to his discussion. The first concerns the apparent prediction of a world mission in Mk. 13.10; 14.9. When Jesus says that the woman who anointed him shall be remembered by her deed wherever the gospel is preached in the whole world, ὅπου ἔσται κηρυχθῆ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, Mk. 14.9, Jeremias doubts that the original logion contemplated a mission entrusted to the disciples. Rather he takes ὅπου as temporal and εὐαγγέλιον "in the early pre-Pauline sense of Rv. 14.6f., where in the hour of final fulfilment, an angelic voice proclaims 'the everlasting gospel of triumph'."¹ He then finds in the closely connected Mk. 13.10, καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, another allusion of Jesus to this "apocalyptic event namely, the angelic proclamation of God's final act."²

1 J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, p. 22.

2 Ibid., p. 23.

It must be said against this however that (1) though ὅπου can have a temporal as well as local significance, the phrase εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον favors the local interpretation for Mk. 14.9. The use of ὅπου with ἔδω and the aor. pass. subj. κηρυχθῆ is indefinite, "wherever" (or possibly "whenever"), Mk. 6.10; 9.18; 14.14, and Jeremias surely strains this sense with his rendering "when" and his application to a specific future event.¹ (2) Furthermore it is extremely doubtful if εὐαγγέλιον was used prior to Paul to designate a final angelic proclamation and Jeremias produces no evidence to the contrary apart from Rv. 14.6f.² A passage like I Cor. 15.1-4, where Paul defines the basic content of the pre-Pauline gospel, and then identifies it with the message that he himself preached at Corinth weighs heavily against Jeremias' supposition. (3) Finally in turning to Mk. 13.10, it is evident from the context that we are not concerned with the hour of fulfillment but with the occurrences which must precede the End, vs. 4. Jesus connects this world-wide preaching of the gospel with the sufferings of his disciples and their witness before governors and kings, and conceives these events as transpiring in the time before the coming of the Son of Man and the final

1. Cf. W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, op. cit., pp. 579, 580; H.E. Dana, J.R. Mantey, op. cit., pp. 245, 246, 277, 278.

2 This holds true for the more detailed development of his argument in J. Jeremias, "Mc. 14.9," Z.N.W., XLIV (1952, 53), 103-107.

gathering of the elect, vss. 9-13; 26, 27.¹ Therefore the most probable solution is to group Mk. 13.10 with passages such as Mt. 24.14; 28.19; Acts 1.6-8; 10.42; Rv. 6.1-8; 19.11 as Cullmann has done² in order to demonstrate that the primitive Christian community regarded preaching to the world as imperative for the interval between the resurrection and parousia.

The second Synoptic passage where Jeremias' interpretation is deficient is Mt. 10.5,6 where Jesus admonishes his disciples, *Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε, καὶ εἰς πόλιν Σαμαριτῶν μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε· πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ.* Jeremias believes that the disciples were convinced that the eschatological hour had dawned and that the gospel must now be proclaimed to the world. Mt. 10.5,6 represents Jesus' protest against this view: "The last hour had not yet arrived; the message of salvation must first be addressed to Israel."³

As we have noted, however, there is no justification for extending the application of Mt. 10.5,6 beyond a limited period of Jesus' lifetime. In Mt. 10.1-15, 40; Mk. 6.7-13; Lk. 9.1-6, the disciples are given a commission to exercise the actual ministry of Jesus for a specified time, at the conclusion of which

1 Vide. Extended Note 4 at the end of Part Three.

2 O. Cullmann, C.E., pp. 229-235. Mk. 14.9; Mt. 10.18; Lk. 21.13 should also be added to this block of evidence. Cf. also A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, pp. 25-28.

3 J. Jeremias, Jesus' Promise to the Nations, p. 72. With his interpretation of Mt. 28.18-20, Ibid., pp. 24, 38, 39 (Cf. above, Extended Note 6, p.132), Jeremias certainly implies that Jesus is himself the source of the disciples' conviction. In this case we are left with the apparent contradiction that Jesus both creates and destroys the impression which his disciples have that the time of fulfillment has come.

they return to their Lord, their status as authorized representatives is dissolved and once again they become his μαθηταί, Mk. 6.30; Lk. 9.10. Thus the commission of which Mt. 10.5,6 is a part, obviously connects with the Jewish ד'ש concept of authority and relationship. The fact that ἀπόστολος in Matthew and Mark appears exclusively in the context of this mission confirms the connection.¹

With the consummation of Jesus' ministry in his death and resurrection God's provision of salvation is complete and the time is ripe for the new task of a world mission to be delegated to his chosen apostles, Mt. 28.18-20; Acts 1.6-8. Both from the content of their message, Acts 2.16; 3.18, 24, 25; I Cor. 15.3, 4; Ro. 1.1-4, and their conviction concerning the Spirit which empowers their ministry, Acts 2.16-18; Ro. 7.6; Tit. 3.5-7, it is clear that they believe that the days of fulfillment have come. Therefore we cannot like Fridrichsen, Jeremias, and Sundkler confine the Gentile mission to a divine act which coincides with the End. On the other hand we must not deny the valid Biblical concept which they have illumined. As Richardson has expressed it, "Jesus thinks of his apostles as sent out into all the world preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God, issuing the invitation to the Messianic Supper,..."²

1 Cf. above, p. 111, nt.3. In Lk. 6.13; 9.10 ἀπόστολος is also employed of the Twelve with reference to this mission but the usage in 17.5; 22.14; 24.10 is probably determined by the application of the term in the early church.

2 A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, p. 278. This statement focuses upon the three-fold orientation of the apostolic ministry: (1) the constraint of the commission coinciding with the resurrection of Christ; (2) the pursuit of a world-wide mission in the interval before the End; (3) the fulfillment of the task in the parousia. The

Their present ministry is conceived as a necessary prelude to the final gathering of God's people, *πρῶτον δεῖ*, Mk. 13.10; *καὶ τότε ἔξει τὸ τέλος*, Mt. 24.14.

This perspective if correct is also incompatible with Munck's view. That the original disciples restrict their preaching to Jews and contemplate a Gentile mission after the conversion of Israel is only admissible if we accept Munck's presupposition, viz. that Mt. 10.5,6 conveys Jesus' direction for the ministry of the Twelve and Mt. 28.18-20 represents the viewpoint of a later time.¹ As we have seen, however, Mt. 10.5, 6 applies only to a limited period of Jesus' earthly ministry, whereas Mt. 28.18-20 corresponds to the commission of the risen Christ and is therefore of the greater significance for determining the consciousness of the original apostles.

Furthermore if the Jerusalem leaders regarded the Gentile mission as a "laborious and superfluous detour," as Munck maintains, we should expect some hint of this attitude in their contacts with those who extend the gospel beyond the Jews. But in Acts the original apostles are always pictured as participating directly in every development of the mission. As the Samaritans receive the word of God through Philip, the apostles at Jerusalem send Peter and John not to counteract his work, or

"now" but "not yet" character which O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, pp. 81-86, 146; N. Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, 27, have found underlying the N.T. concept of the Christian life must also be applied to the task of the apostles.

1 J. Munck, *P.H.*, pp. 251-254, 275.

redirect his activity, but to establish the results of his mission through the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. Peter himself assumes a key role in the Gentile mission with the conversion of Cornelius.¹

When a number of Gentiles receive the Christian faith at Antioch, the Jerusalem community immediately delegates Barnabas to review the situation. From his later relations with Jerusalem, Acts 11.27; 12.25; 15.1-35; Gal. 2.1-18, there is every reason to believe that his approval and sharing of the work at Antioch was fully confirmed by the apostles.²

1 M. Dibelius, "The Conversion of Cornelius", Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 109-122 has attempted to distinguish the authentic narrative of Cornelius' conversion from Luke's additions to the legend. As these latter he cites Peter's vision 10.9-16, the comment upon the vision, 10.27-29, the speech to Cornelius, 10.34-43, Peter's apology before the *ἐκ κειρῶν*, and isolated vss. 10.23b; 10.45, 48; 11.12b. According to Dibelius Luke has incorporated into this simple conversion account later developments which only arise with the discussion of Gal. 2.1-10, and with Peter's behaviour at Antioch, Gal. 2.11ff. Against Dibelius, however, it is difficult to conceive of Peter supporting Paul in opposition to the radicals at Jerusalem, Gal. 2.1-10, if he had not been prepared by his own experience for the free admission of the Gentiles; nor can we justify Paul's charge of hypocrisy in Gal. 2.11ff. unless Peter had previously been led to a settled conviction regarding table fellowship. Therefore, although there is a possibility that Luke has misplaced events chronologically, cf. H.J. Cadbury, The Book of Acts in History, p. 59; W. Grundmann, op. cit., pp. 128-132, the problems presented by the conversion of Cornelius correspond to the development of issues in Gal. 2, and confirm the fact that it was not the admission of Gentiles as such that concerned the original apostles. Cf. C.S.C. Williams, op. cit., p. 134; C.H. Turner, "St. Peter in the New Testament," Theology, XIII, (1926), 77, 78.

2 This evidence contradicts the tendency of E. Meyer, op. cit., III, 148-157; W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 27, 28, 40, 41, 50, 66-70, 83-84, 156-159, 193-195; and F.J. Foakes-Jackson, K. Lake, "The Disciples in Jerusalem," The Beginnings of Christianity, I, 309-318 to trace the origin of the Gentile mission entirely to Stephen and the Hellenists: Through their efforts the gospel moves beyond the borders of Judea, and Paul is cited as a convert of Hellenistic Christianity in Damascus. With the founding of the church at Antioch,

This Acts presentation of the Jewish Christian apostles cooperating in the extension of the Gentile mission would be highly suspect were it not harmonious with the picture that we derive from the Epistles. In Gal. 1, when Paul outlines his activity from the time of his conversion to his mission in Syria and Cilicia, he concludes by saying that the response of the Judean churches was to glorify God. In the light of Barnabas' invitation to Paul to enter the work at Antioch, Acts 11.25, we may conclude that already Paul had a reputation in Jerusalem as a missionary to Gentiles;¹ nevertheless

there arises a center which challenges the dominance of Jerusalem and champions the cause of world-wide mission in opposition to Jewish Christian particularism. However, although it must be recognised that both language and cultural background would predispose the Hellenist Jews to a pioneer role in the Gentile mission, it must also be observed that this mission is never repudiated by the original apostles but rather incorporated into their own program. This favors the interpretation of R. Liechtenhan, Die urchristliche Mission, pp. 48-55 that the point of contention between the Hellenist and Hebrew Jews is not the admission of Gentiles but the place of the Law and the Temple worship in the light of Christ's coming. The Hellenist position provides a stimulus to world-wide mission, but both groups are united in envisioning and actively seeking the conversion of the Gentiles. Cf. also P. Feine, Der Apostel Paulus, pp. 210-214; J. Parkes, op. cit., pp. 104, 105; O. Cullmann, "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel," E.T., LXXI (1959), 8-12, 39-43, who, in an attempt to demonstrate that Johannine Christianity paralleled rather than succeeded the viewpoint of the Synoptic Gospels, connects this Johannine group with Stephen and the Hellenists and with non-conformist Judaism represented in the Qumran Essenes on the basis of a common negative attitude towards the Temple worship.

¹ W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 68; A.D. Nock, op. cit., pp. 87, 88; contra J.V. Bartlet, "Paul," Encyclopaedia Britannica, XVII, 388. Paul's reference to the Judean churches undoubtedly includes Jerusalem and indicates that the Twelve had extended their mission into the surrounding territory. E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 62-64; W. Bousset, Der Brief an die Galater, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, II, 37, 38. That we know little of their individual accomplishments, and that some of their names were obviously forgotten does not lead to the conclusion that they remained a resident college in Jerusalem,

this has not affected the positive reaction to his ministry, καὶ ἐδόξαζον ἐν ἑμοὶ τὸν Θεόν, Gal. 1.24.

If the original apostles had actually believed that Paul's Gentile mission was rushing ahead of a divinely ordained sequence of events, this basic difference in outlook would certainly have been expressed at the meeting in Jerusalem, Gal. 2.1-10. Instead the discussion centers on the terms by which Gentiles may be admitted to the church and concludes with the acceptance of Paul's mission as a work of God, ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνέργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, vs. 8. This reveals a fundamental inconsistency in Munck's view. The original apostles are placed in the impossible position of believing that God will only save the Gentiles after Israel is converted and yet according to Gal. 2.7-9, they agree that God through Paul is saving the Gentiles now.

The information obtained from the Acts and the Epistles more readily supports the acceptance of Mt. 28.16-20, Acts 1.6-11 as descriptions of Christ's commission and favors the assumption that the original apostles from the time of the resurrection are

as J. Munck, P.A.T., pp. 108, 109 contends, but rather would support the view of B.H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, pp. 29-38 that they left the city at an early date in order to pursue their mission. W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 77-87 cites the changing situation in Jerusalem, the missionary activity of Peter and John, the rise of James the Lord's brother, and Gal. 1.22 itself as evidence of this departure.

motivated by the responsibility for a world-wide mission. Their apparent hesitation in entering fully into this mission does not require us to suppose that they restricted their preaching to Jews. Naturally they would not want to depart from Jerusalem before the Christian community there was firmly established. Furthermore they may have regarded Jerusalem as an ideal center from which the gospel could spread through the world, Acts 15.16-18. The expectation of Christ's imminent return could also have influenced their desire to remain in the holy place, Acts 1.9-11.¹

Perhaps the main factor which prevented an immediate appeal to Gentiles was the primitive Christian belief that the Jews had a prior right to hear the gospel, Acts 3.25,26.² Obviously Paul himself accepts this viewpoint, not only as a theological presupposition, Ro. 1.16; 9.4,5; 15.8; Acts 13.46 but also as a practical expedient since the Jewish synagogue afforded an audience that was prepared for the Christian message, Acts 13.14; 14.1; 17.1,10,17; 18.4, 19.³ Finally what appears

1 W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 85.

2 This belief helps to account for the widespread tradition that the original apostles were commanded by Jesus to preach to the Jews in Jerusalem before extending the mission throughout the world. We find this as early as the first half of the second century in the Preaching of Peter, recorded by Clement of Alexandria, Stromatum, Lib. VI. 5 (P.G., IX, 264). A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, I, 49 accepts the tradition as genuine, but B.H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, is probably correct in his opinion that it is a typological expression arising from the reference to Peter's departure in Acts 12.17. J. Wagenmann, op. cit., p. 15 also argues against Harnack's position.

3 T. Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. comm., I, 265-267; M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, p. 301; W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 68, 69.

to be reluctance to pursue the Gentile mission can often be interpreted as a phase of the tremendous adjustment which this mission demanded from Law-abiding Jews. Serious questions concerning conditions by which Gentiles could be admitted to the church and incorporated into the Christian fellowship do not depreciate the conviction of the early church that the gospel must be preached throughout the world before the End.¹

Thus in spite of these various conditioning factors the original apostles, as we have seen, cooperate and participate in every extension of the church. Obviously they regarded the Gentile mission neither as an eschatological act of God (Friedrichsen), nor as a consequence of Israel's salvation (Munck), but as their own present responsibility in the strength of the Holy Spirit. With this commission to preach throughout the world it is unlikely that they would have tolerated an ethnological division of the mission, Gal. 2.7-9, particularly if they were not in complete accord with Paul's work. This is the difficulty of Cullmann's view. He correctly observes that the Gentile mission was not initiated by Paul but by the original Jerusalem apostles under the direction of Peter. But in regarding

1 R. Liechtenhan, op. cit., pp. 31, 32, 40, 55-58; E.F. Scott, The Beginnings of the Church, pp. 128-132. H.H. Rowley, The Biblical Doctrine of Election, p. 144, in an attempt to account for the apostles' apparent hesitation in responding to Christ's command, Mt. 28.19, 20 presents still another explanation which must be considered. "But surely it is precisely similar to their attitude on so many things, as they appear before us in the Gospels. They completely failed to understand our Lord's teaching about his own death, until the fact of the Cross made them think back over his teaching. It was as easy for them to preserve the memory of a missionary injunction and to think of it in an ideal rather than a practical way as it was for Judaism to preserve the Scriptures which set its missionary vocation before it without addressing itself seriously to its mission."

the Gal. 2.1-10 encounter as a "decisive church split" which establishes two independent missionary organizations, Cullmann can provide no reason why the Jerusalem group were willing to turn the Gentile work over to Paul. If Gal. 2.7-9 represented a division which expressed an unbridged difference in the concept of grace as Cullmann says, would the original apostles have relinquished their own responsibility to the Gentiles and committed their task to a man with whom they could not agree?

Although we shall return to this question later we can nevertheless conclude with Gaechter that Gal. 2.7-9 cannot be interpreted as an ethnological division at all.¹ Rather it is a recognition of the particular way in which God has endowed his apostles and employed them in the mission of the gospel, Gal. 2.7,8. There is no arbitrary ethnological partition but merely a determination to concentrate their efforts according to the evident direction of God, vs. 9. "The agreement, which was concluded, had no judicial character; it signified, that the two partners, each according to his proven abilities were to follow the leading of grace to the present time, by which one had achieved results principally among the Jews, the other among the Gentiles."²

1 P. Gaechter, Petrus und seine Zeit, pp. 384-386.

2 Ibid., p. 385; G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, pp. 50-52.

IV

Galatians 2.7-9 as a Division of Territory

The third interpretation which Jeremias has proposed for Gal. 2.7-9 is the geographical one: Paul and Peter each assume the responsibility for the mission in a specific territory. As we have noted, Munck believes that Peter is assigned the populous Jewish districts of Palestine, Syria, Cilicia, Mesopotamia and Egypt while Paul takes the Gentiles in the rest of the Roman Empire. Fridrichsen advocates a less proportionate division, restricting Peter to the Jews of Palestine and allotting the world beyond to Paul. Just as Peter is given leadership within his sector, so Paul feels himself responsible for the Gentile mission in his entire area.

The difficulties involved in interpreting Gal. 2.7-9 according to an ethnological partition or to a difference between the Petrine and Pauline gospels seem to lead to this geographical solution. However in the light of our information concerning the subsequent activity of Peter and Paul and the tradition connected with the spread of Christianity, a geographical division, whether Munck's or Fridrichsen's, appears highly questionable.

More than one scholar has remarked over Paul's apparent indifference to Egypt and the city of Alexandria, though it is more than probable that Christianity began there in Paul's time.¹

¹ C. Weizäcker, *op. cit.*, I, 230; A. Deissmann, *Paul*, pp. 229-231; B.H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church*, p. 45; P. Gaechter, *op. cit.*, p. 384; and S.G.F. Brandon, *op. cit.*, pp. 6, 17-30 who therefore concludes that both Paul and Luke Acts oppose Apollos and Alexandrian Christianity.

The letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians, A.D. 41, arouses interest with its warning against admitting "Jews who come down the river from Syria or Egypt", ἀπὸ Συρίας ἢ Αἰγύπτου καταπλέοντας Ἰουδαίους, and its promise of vengeance upon them "as fomenters of what is a general plague infecting the whole world", καθάπερ κοινὴν τεῖνα τῆς οἰκουμένης νόσον ἐξεγείροντας.¹

This has been connected with Claudius' expulsion of the Jews from Rome, Acts 18.2², and taken as evidence of the agitation caused by the early preaching of Christ in Alexandrian Synagogues.³ Though this remains a matter of conjecture, the existence of a settled Christian church in Egypt in the early second century can be established on the basis of two recent finds, the Rylands fragment of the Gospel of John and the so-called British Museum Gospel.⁴ The discovery of these documents

1 Letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians (Select Papyri, II, Loeb, 86,87).

2 Suetonius, Divus Claudius, XXV.4 (Loeb, p. 52).

3 A. Loisy, op. cit., pp. 130, 131, 382. W. Seston, L'Empereur Claude et les Chrétiens, R.H.P.R., (1931), pp. 275-304 has argued effectively against the connection to Christian preaching: In A.D. 41 (1) Christianity would not be distinguished from Judaism, (2) would not be designated a νόσος by official Rome, and (3) would not have spread throughout the world. Seston takes νόσος as an allusion to civil dissension in general and illustrates this meaning from the literature of the period, particularly Philo. H. I. Bell, Jews and Christians in Egypt, pp. 16-17 refers the letter of Claudius to riots which broke out upon the visit of Herod Agrippa I to Alexandria shortly before his accession, and which are described by both Philo, In Flaccum, V-XI (Loeb, IX, 317-357), and Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae, XVIII 8.1 (Dindorfius, I, 719). The attempt to find an indication of the impact of Christianity upon Alexandria in Philo's narration of these events has been made by S.G.F. Brandon, op. cit., pp. 223, 224.

4 An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel, ed. C.H. Roberts, pp. 5, 6, 24-26, 28; Fragments of an Unknown Gospel, ed. H. I. Bell, pp. 8-15, 38, 39.

in Egypt supports Bell's opinion that Christianity reached Alexandria before the end of the first century.¹ Indeed there is no reason to doubt Luke's implication that Apollos was instructed in the Christian faith in Alexandria, Acts 18.25, a probability which Codex D make explicit with its reading *ὅς ἦν κατηχημένος ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τὸν λόγον.* ²

There is no trace whatever that Paul contributed to this early spread of Christianity to Egypt, either by engaging in a personal campaign, by delegating members of his staff, or by asserting his influence through correspondence. Possibly there is an indirect recognition of the evangelization of Egypt in Ro. 15.14-25 where Paul expresses his refusal to go where the gospel has already been preached and states accordingly his intention to press forward to Spain. As Goguel remarks, "He would surely have thought of Egypt rather than Spain if it had still been virgin territory."³ Ro. 15.14-25

1 H. Bell, Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt, pp. 79, 80; E.J. Goodspeed, A. History of Early Christian Literature, pp. 77-80. Accepting Goodspeed's date and Egyptian location for the Preaching of Peter, 100-110 A.D., Ibid., pp. 130-133, 309; M.R. James, op. cit., pp. 16-19, would require the evangelization of Egypt well before the end of the first century. Cf. also G. Quispel, "The Jung Codex and its Significance," The Jung Codex, ed. F.L. Cross, pp. 37-39, 45-60 who with his investigation of the recently acquired Jung Codex has thrown considerable light on the existence of a vigorous "orthodox Gnosticism" at Alexandria in the second century.

2 K. Lake, H.J. Cadbury, Translation and Commentary, The Beginnings of Christianity, IV, 231-233; C.S.C. Williams, op. cit., p. 215; Cf. also Acts 19.1-7. In speculating over the origin of Christianity in Egypt A. Loisy, op. cit., p. 130 calls attention to the mention of Egypt, Libya, and Cyrene in the account of Pentecost, Acts 2.10, the Cyrenian who is said to have carried Christ's cross, Mk. 15.21, and Lucius of Cyrene and Simeon "the Black" who figure in the church at Antioch, Acts 13.1.

3 M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, p. 7; Thus also G. Sass, op. cit., p. 130.

thus involves the commission which restricts Paul to a pioneer mission.¹ Neither here nor elsewhere is there an indication that he felt any responsibility for Alexandria and this silence would be remarkable if he had been entrusted with the Christian mission in Egypt as Fridrichsen maintains.

Alexandria is also a stumbling block to Munck's geographical division, where Peter assumes the obligation of the Egyptian mission. Though Peter is linked by tradition to the churches of Antioch, Corinth, and Rome,² he has not been connected with Alexandria. A relevant legend states that Mark, the spokesman of Peter, was the first bishop of Alexandria.³ However there is no mention of this tradition in either Clement of Alexandria or Origen and its authenticity has been generally denied.⁴

Furthermore neither Munck's nor Fridrichsen's division allows for the apparent relation of Peter to Gentile Christian churches in the north-western provinces of Asia Minor, Pontus

1 Cf. above pp. 46-52.

2 O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, pp. 52-55; 77-152.

3 Eusebius, Historiae Ecclesiasticae, II 16 (P.G., XX, 173).

4 A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, II 304-308; B.H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, p. 233; W. Bauer, Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum, pp. 49, 50. S.G.F. Brandon, op. cit., pp. 210-212, 224-226, 250, 251 argues that the other place, *etc. εἰς τὸν τόπον*, Acts 12.17 to which Peter departs is Alexandria, which then becomes the locus of Jewish Christianity following the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70. The argument depends however on the almost inconceivable fact that the origins of the church (including the coming of Peter) were forgotten.

Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, I Pt. 1.1.¹ The Petrine authorship of the First Epistle, unlike the Second, was undisputed in the early church,² but is contested today on the basis of three principal arguments: (1) The literary quality of the composition is hardly to be expected of a Galilean fisherman, (2) I Peter appears to exhibit a dependency upon the Pauline Epistles. (3) The kind of persecution to which the Epistle refers, I Pt., 1.6; 3.13-17; 4.12-19, does not accord with conditions during Peter's lifetime.³ These arguments have been attacked in the brilliant commentary of Selwyn. He sees the Epistle as a collaborative effort of Peter and Silvanus, I Pt. 5.12, men who are drawing material from sources which form the corporate tradition of the

1 F.J.A. Hort, The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 17; contra. T. Zahn, op. cit., II, 134-139, who claims that the designation embraces all of Asia Minor except Cilicia and includes the churches founded there by Paul. E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, p. 45 presents the contrary suggestion that Paul specifically avoided the area of I Pet. 1.1 because a mission ("under the direction of Peter himself!") was already in progress there, though Acts 16.6,7 simply attributes Paul's decision to the leading of the Spirit. The most plausible view in the light of Acts and the Epistle to the Galatians is that of H. Windisch, Die Katholischen Briefe, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, p. 48 who states that the churches addressed cannot be attributed directly to either Peter or Paul but are rather the offspring of original Pauline communities, Acts 19.10. From I Pt. 1.18; 2.10 and esp. 4.3-5, there is general agreement, however, that the membership of these churches is primarily Gentile. Therefore according to the most probable explanation for the designation of the Epistle, Peter, in direct contrast to the interpretation which both Munck and Fridrichsen have placed upon Gal. 2.7-9, is associated with Gentile Christian churches in north-western Asia Minor that stem from communities originally founded by Paul.

2 Cf. Eusebius, Historiae Ecclesiasticae III 3; III 25 (P.G., XX, 216, 268) who classifies First Peter among the ὁμιλοῦσθαι.

3 F.W. Beare, The First Epistle of St. Peter, pp. 10-16, 24-31; A. Harnack, Die Chronologie der altchristliche Literatur, pp. 451-455; C.L. Mitton, "The Relationship between I Peter and Ephesians," J.T.S., I (1950) pp. 67-73.

primitive church. Moreover Selwyn finds no reference that cannot be accounted for by a persecution that is "spasmodic and particular rather than organized on a universal scale."¹

Accordingly he proposes A.D. 63/64 as the date for the Epistle.

The case against Munck and Fridrichsen remains, however, even if one regards the Epistle as pseudonymous and locates it in the reign of Domitian, A.D. 81-96.² For it is hardly likely that an unknown author before the end of the first century could choose a specific area of Asia Minor as the designation for his Epistle, and succeed in having it accepted as a genuine Petrine work unless there was an authentic tradition which cited Peter as the founder or more probably the responsible overseer of the churches in the territory mentioned.

1 E.G. Selwyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-36, 52-56; J. Moffatt, *The General Epistles, M.N.T.C.*, pp. 85-88; and A.H. McNeile, *op. cit.*, pp. 206-212 also accept Peter as the author. The argument of W.M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 242-245, 251, 280-282, 290-295, that *ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ*, I Pt. 4.14, *μή γάρ τις ὑμῶν παύσῃ ὡς φονεὺς* etc. *ἐν δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός*, vss. 15, 16, indicates a later period of official Roman policy towards Christianity can only be sustained if we take the phrase as a description of a judicial procedure rather than the general reproach which the name *Χριστιανός* connoted. Taken in the latter sense, however, I Pet. 4.14-16 could correspond to the original significance of the designation in Antioch, Acts 11.26, and its obvious derogatory application in Rome during the reign of Nero, Tacitus, *Annals*, XV.44 (Loeb, p. 282); Suetonius, *Nero*, XVI (Loeb, p. 110). Cf. T. Zahn, *op. cit.*, II, 191-194.

2 W.M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 280-288 who nevertheless retains the Petrine authorship; R. Knopf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judä*, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, pp. 24, 25.

The knowledge of First Peter which seems to be evident in the First Epistle of Clement is a formidable obstacle to anyone who dates the Epistle to correspond to the general persecution of Trajan's reign, 98-117 A.D.¹ Nevertheless it is significant that Beare, who finds an occasion for the Epistle in the correspondence of Pliny with Trajan, 110-112 A.D., is still prepared to acknowledge the genuine connection of Peter to the designated district, I Pt. 1.1.²

The geographical divisions of Munck and Fridrichsen are further challenged by the possibility that Peter laboured in Corinth. The tradition claiming that both Peter and Paul "planted" and "taught" in the Corinthian church appears first in a letter from Dionysius of Corinth to Soter of Rome at around

1 A. Harnack, Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur, pp. 454, 461 who therefore dates the Epistle 83-93 A.D., but views the salutation and closing remarks as later additions. For a comprehensive analysis of the use of First Peter in the Apostolic Fathers vide C. Bigg, Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, I.C.C., pp. 7-15. Cf. also S. Clement of Rome, The Apostolic Fathers, ed. J.B. Lightfoot, Pt. I, I, 95, 96.

2 F.W. Beare, op. cit., p. 30; J. Lebreton, J. Zeiller, The History of the Primitive Church, trans. E.C. Messenger, I, 232 write of I Pt. 1.1, "Even if this address was not his own work, it would bear witness to a very ancient tradition linking Peter with these lands." The situation which Pliny, the governor of Bithynia-Pontus describes to Trajan, Pliny, Epistularum, X.96 (Loeb, pp. 400-404) can be related convincingly to the persecution of I Pet.; Cf. J. Knox, "Pliny ad I Peter," J.B.L., LXXII (1953), 187-189. But to represent the persecution of Pliny's administration as the first concerted effort against the church in this area as F.W. Beare, op. cit., pp. 13-15 has done is unwarranted. Pliny's ignorance of an official policy does not preclude prior official action. His reference to a few Christians who had denied their faith twenty five years earlier can be taken as evidence of previous measures against Christianity. Cf. A.H. McNeile, op. cit., pp. 210-212.

170 A.D., καὶ γὰρ ἄμω καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φεταδουντες ἡμῶς ὁμοῶς ἐδίδασκαν.¹ The account of Acts 18.1-21 and Paul's own statements concerning the origin of the Christian community at Corinth, I Cor. 3.6, 10; 4.14, 15, reveal the fallacy of citing Peter as a co-founder, but possibly Dionysius is using his terms in a general sense, intending only to say that both apostles had ministered there in the early days of the church.

A stronger case can be made for a visit of Peter to Corinth from the exegesis of I Corinthians, notably I Cor. 1.12; 3.22 where a group giving allegiance to Peter is mentioned, and I Cor. 9.5 where Peter is distinguished as one who travels accompanied by his wife.² Countering this interpretation Weiss and Goguel argue that a party appealing to Peter, but not personally founded by him provides a more reasonable explanation.³ The fact that Paul does not refer to Peter but only to Apollos when he describes the actual progress of the work in Corinth, I Cor. 3.1-15, supports their view. In terms of our discussion, however, it is apparent again that either side of this debate weighs heavily against Munck and Fridrichsen. For even if Peter never actually ministered at Corinth, the existence of a party which pits his authority against Paul's is hardly conceivable if there was an apostolic decision which denied him

1 Eusebius, Historiae Ecclesiasticae, II 25 (P.G., XX, 209).

2 E. Meyer, op. cit., III, 441; O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, pp. 53-55.

3 J. Weiss, Der erste Korintherbrief, pp. XXXIV-XXXVI; M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, pp. 308-313.

any jurisdiction in the area. And if Peter's travels were familiar enough to the Corinthians, to enable Paul to single him out as an example of a particular missionary policy, I Cor. 9.5, there is at least the likelihood that these travels had been in the proximity of Corinth.

Finally the strong tradition that Peter and Paul were both martyred in Rome during the reign of Nero, 54-68 A.D., argues against a geographical interpretation of Gal. 2.7-9 especially if, like Munck, one holds that the partition lasted until Paul's death.¹ Interest in the possible residence of Peter in Rome has been recently increased by the excavations under the present Cathedral of St. Peter's. The resulting discoveries have not resolved this debate. Their value has been rather to confirm the reliability of ancient tradition, particularly the famous reference of the Roman presbyter Gaius who locates the "trophies," *τρόφαια* of Peter and Paul on the Vatican hill and the Via Ostiensis respectively.² That the excavations have actually disclosed the trophy of Peter to

1 Remarkably enough, Munck accepts the tradition that Peter came to Rome and died there. However, to preserve the geographical division which he finds underlying Gal. 2.7-9, he advances the opinion that Peter was forced to go to Rome as a prisoner of the State, J. Munck, *P.H.*, p. 133. Besides the lack of any positive evidence, the likelihood of this view is decreased by the probabilities that Peter was not a Roman citizen, had no right of appeal to Caesar and possessed no available means to support his trial in the highest court. Cf. W.M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen*, pp. 310-313; H.J. Cadbury, "Roman Law and the Trial of Paul," *The Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 312-319; C.S.C. Williams, *op cit.*, p. 258.

2 Eusebius, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, II, 25 (P.G., XX, 269).

which Gaius refers has been generally accepted.¹ Nevertheless the decisive questions remain: (1) Does Gaius' *τρόπιον* mark the site of an execution, a grave, or is it merely a monument? (2) What is the relation of the *τρόπιον* to the memorial shrine located in 1915 beneath the Basilica of St. Sebastian where, according to Pope Damasus, Peter and Paul dwelt, *Hic habitasse prius sanctos cognoscere debes, nomina quisque Petri pariter Paulique requiris?*² Even if further investigation were to provide definite answers to these questions, we would still be separated by a century (dating the construction of the original Vatican hill *τρόπιον* at A.D. 165)³ from Peter's death.⁴

In bridging this gap we must depend entirely upon the references in early Christian literature. Thus in I Pt. 5.13 where greetings are sent from *ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτῇ*, "Babylon" is commonly taken as a symbolic designation for Rome.⁵ There

1 O. Cullmann, *Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr*, pp. 142-146; J.M.C. Toynbee, J.W. Perkins, *The Shrine of St. Peter*, p. 154 H. Chadwick, "St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome; The Problem of the Memoria Apostolorum ad Catacumbas," *J.T.S.*, VIII, (1957), 31.

2 Text given by H. Chadwick, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

3 A. Gerkan, "Die Forschung nach dem Grab Petri," *Z.N.W.*, XLIV (1952, 53), 202.

4 Vide. Extended Note 5 at the end of Part Three.

5 This poses the problem of whether such a cryptic name would have been referred to Rome as early as Nero's reign, 54-68 A.D. (assuming the Petrine authorship). Cf. however the use of "Jerusalem," Gal. 4.26; Hb. 12.22 and the probable application of Babylon to Rome in Rv. 17.18. The identification with Rome is ably defended by E.G. Selwyn, *op. cit.*, pp. 243, 244, 303-305; O. Cullmann, *Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr*, pp. 82-86; Taking "Babylon" literally as J. Munck, *P.H.*, p. 270 has done presents even greater difficulties, particularly the improbability that Peter would ever choose the Mesopotamian city as a mission center. Though Josephus mentions that the place was still inhabited, he states elsewhere that the entire Jewish population

is no location mentioned in the prophesy of Jesus recorded in Jn. 21.18, 19 but the fact that Peter's martyrdom is envisioned is evident from the author's post eventum comment, τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν σημαίνων πρὸς θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν Θεόν. It is also significant that from the time of Tertullian the words of Jn. 21.18, 19 were applied to Peter's crucifixion in Rome.¹ Though II Pt. 1.14 was probably written in the first half of the second century,² it also can be taken as an important witness to Peter's martyrdom.

The decisive text in the case for Peter's death in Rome is found however in the non-canonical Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians which can be dated in the last decade of the first century.³ Clement cites the experience of seven individuals from the O.T. in order to impress upon the Corinthians the harm which stems from jealousy and strife, I Cl. 4.⁴ In I Cl. 5 he then turns to familiar examples, ἔλαθμεν ἐκ τούτων ἑγγιστά γενομένους ἀθλητάς, to men of his own generation, λάβομεν τῆς γενεᾶς ἡμῶν τὰ γενναῖα ὑποδείγματα. He includes Peter among the contemporary victims of ζῆλος ἄδικος with a brief mention of his

had evacuated during the reign of Caligula, 37-41 A.D., Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae XV 2.2; XVIII 9.8,9 (Dindorfius, I 575, 731, 732).

1 Tertullian, Adversus Gnosticos Scorpiace, 15 (P.L., II, 151).

2 F.H. Chase, "Peter, Second Epistle", H.D.B., III, 796-817; A.H. McNeile, op. cit., pp. 233-238.

3 The Apostolic Fathers, ed. J.B. Lightfoot, Pt. I, I, 67; A. Harnack, Die Chronologie der altchristliche Literature, I, 255.

4 The following texts from I Clement are taken from The Apostolic Fathers, ed. J.B. Lightfoot, pp. 7,8.

suffering, ending with the phrase, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. Following this he refers to Paul, presenting a concise but more detailed summary of his career which concludes with the words, καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον ἐπορεύθη. The debate centers upon two issues: (1) Does Clement use the aor. part. μαρτυρήσας, not in the general sense of "witness", "testimony", but in the specific significance of "martyrdom"? (2) Does he mean to imply that the deaths of Peter and Paul occurred at Rome?

It must be acknowledged that no absolute conclusions can be drawn but nevertheless the weight of probability favors an affirmative response to both these questions. Because Paul's martyrdom in Rome is virtually unchallenged it is convincing to argue from the known to the unknown. The almost identical expression with μαρτυρήσας in either case indicates that Clement intended to parallel the experience of the two apostles.¹ Further evidence is provided by the context: Peter and Paul are singled out as examples from the pillars (στόλοι) of the

¹ Thus R. Knopf, Der erste Clemensbrief, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, p. 51; also O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, pp. 94,95; contra K. Heussi, War Petrus wirklich römischer Märtyrer?, pp. 3-8. The suggestion of K. Holl, op. cit., pp. 65,66 that Clement depends entirely on the Pauline epistles for his resume of the apostle's career, has been taken up by K. Heussi, op. cit., pp. 17, 18 and E.T. Merrill, Essays in Early Christian History, pp. 290-292 and applied to Peter as well. According to this view, Clement draws his material concerning Peter from the Book of Acts. However, it is evident that the argument can only stand if one presupposes its conclusion, namely that Clement is not reporting the martyrdom of Peter and Paul. But if that in fact is the author's intention then he has communicated information which is neither in the Epistles nor Acts.

church, who according to Clement are ἀθληταί who ἕως θανάτου ἠθλήσαν.¹

As regards the second question, a Roman location for the death of the two apostles seems to provide the best explanation for Clement's choice of Peter and Paul rather than other members of the σὺλλοι. This assumption accords well with ἔγγιστα, τῆς γενεᾶς ἡμῶν, τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποστόλους, terminology which reveals Clement's close association and familiarity with the persons and events he describes. The most explicit indication that Clement locates Peter's and Paul's martyrdom in Rome comes with his reference to countless lesser known Christians who likewise suffered διὰ ἑλλος, I Cl. 6. He unites (συνηθροίσθη) them with Peter and Paul as individuals who were an example ἐν ἡμῖν.²

A final reference that is pertinent to our discussion is from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans, which can be dated within the first two decades of the second century.³ Journeying to his own martyrdom in Rome, Ignatius writes, οὐκ ὥς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διαπάσσεσθαι ἡμῖν, I Ro. 4.3.⁴ It is difficult to account for his allusion to Peter and Paul in this particular letter apart

1 For the connection of ἀθλητής to martyrdom cf. W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, op. cit., p. 21; W.M. Calder, "Studies in Early Christian Epigraphy", Journal of Roman Studies, X (1920) 52,53; Cf. also the Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp 1.3 (A.F., p. 132).

2 Vide the complete development of this last argument in H. Lietzmann, Petrus und Paulus in Rom, pp. 229-235.

3 W. Bauer, Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, pp. 187, 188; E.J. Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 20.

4 The Apostolic Fathers, ed. J.B. Lightfoot, p. 121.

from the tradition of their ministry in Rome. Together with the preceding evidence the witness of Ignatius leads us to Lietzmann's conclusion, "All of the oldest documentary sources from the time around 100 become clear and easily understandable, fit well in context and correspond to each other, through the assumption clearly drawn from them that Peter has stayed in Rome and died a martyr's death in the same place. Every other supposition concerning the fate of Peter piles difficulty upon difficulty and can never even cite a single source as a positive support for itself."¹

Therefore the canonical and non-canonical tradition of the church of Rome, as well as the churches of Corinth, north-western Asia Minor, and Alexandria makes it extremely unlikely that the Christian mission was conducted according to a division of the field. There is no mention of such a division in any of our sources, including Gal. 2.7-9. Men who expected the imminent return of Christ might share their plans for the immediate future, but they would hardly subscribe to a geographical partition that was to apply for the next fifteen years.

At any rate we know that Paul did not make his plans according to a territorial agreement. His movements are governed by the consciousness of being called to a pioneer work among the

1 H. Lietzmann, Petrus und Paulus in Rom, p. 238; For a summary of the second century testimony to this tradition, cf. S. Clement of Rome, The Apostolic Fathers, ed. J.B. Lightfoot, Pt. I, I, pp. 490-501; C.H. Turner, op. cit., pp. 196-204; F.J.F. Jackson, Peter: Prince of Apostles, pp. 151-164.

Gentiles, Ro. 15.18-20. Paul's coming to Rome is no exception to this rule as Cullmann believes. From Ro. 15.24 we learn that the Apostle's objective is the unworked area of Spain, and his stay in Rome is *στατορῶμενος*, thus according with his usual practice of establishing a firm base before extending his missionary operation.¹ If Paul considered his visit to Rome a breach of principle we would hardly expect to find the clearest affirmation of the principle in his Epistle to that church.

Neither is there any support for Fridrichsen's view that Paul feels himself responsible for the whole Gentile mission. The evidence which Fridrichsen cites from the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians can be understood out of Paul's concern for churches which were direct offspring of his own communities, and what Fridrichsen regards as Paul's attempt to assert his authority in Rome can be taken as his desire to locate a foundation for the western mission.² As we have seen there is no indication that he felt any obligation for the vast areas of Egypt and Africa. Indeed as Gaechter has observed, Paul, the debtor to Greeks and barbarians, Ro. 1.14, could have gone in any direction from Palestine. However his activity is continually aimed toward the West, and there is no trace of responsibility for the mission in any other field but his own.³

1 Cf. above, pp. 46-49.

2 Thus C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. XXV; J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, 357-360. J. Munck, P.H., pp. 293, 294.

3 P. Gaechter, op. cit., p. 384.

Obviously this procedure is not determined by an assignment to leadership in a prescribed area of Gentile Christianity. Rather in dependence upon the Spirit of God, he plans his course of action with one consideration in view, namely that his particular commission be fruitfully fulfilled.

Still less do Peter's movements correspond with a geographical division such as Munck and Fridrichsen have proposed. Such an interpretation has no explanation for the fact that before the end of the first Century Peter is connected to the churches of north-western Asia Minor, the church of Corinth, and the church of Rome. The more reasonable assumption is that Peter like Paul planned his moves according to the particular commission that he had received from Christ. Since he cannot be regarded as the founder of the churches in Asia Minor, Corinth and Rome it is obvious, however, that his commission did not like Paul's restrict him to a pioneer work. The narrative of Peter's activity in Acts as well as the tradition that we have cited, suggest rather that he exercised the authority of an overseer and fulfilled what Goguel has called a "roving commission".¹ This corresponds as well with the Gospel accounts of the special task which Jesus assigns to Peter, the appointment of Mt. 16.16-20, and especially the responsibility of Jn. 21.15-18, βόσκε τὰ πρόβατά μου.

1 M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, p. 152.

V

Galatians 2.7-9 as a Partnership in the One Mission of the Church

By rejecting an interpretation of Gal. 2.7-9 based upon (1) a difference in gospel, (2) an ethnological separation or (3) a geographical partition, no alternative seems to remain for defining the relation which Paul achieves with the Jerusalem apostles. However it is precisely the failure of these three views that accentuates the only satisfactory explanation. The false presupposition common to each is that Gal. 2.7-9 reports a division between Paul and the pillars. The fact is that Paul is describing an agreement. A schism is not enacted but avoided. Nothing is said of two distinct understandings of the sequence of events in God's salvation program (Munck) nor of the creation of two separate missionary organizations (Cullmann). Rather Gal. 2.7-9 represents the union of the Jewish Christian mission with its center in Jerusalem, and the work of Paul who until this time has remained aloof of Jerusalem and proceeded with no direct relation to the pillar apostles.¹

Paul summarizes the results of the conference, Gal. 2.1-10, by means of two principal declarations, the first negative and the second positive: In vs. 6 he writes, ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσέθεοντο, and Moffat's rendering, "these authorities had no additions to make to my gospel," accurately conveys Paul's meaning in the context of the central issue of the conference.²

1 Vide. Extended Note 6 at the end of Part Three.

2 G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, p. 49; Cf. above, pp. 145, 146.

The positive statement occurs in vs. 9, 'Ιάκωβος καὶ Κηφᾶς καὶ 'Ιωάννης, οἱ δοκοῦντες στήλοι εἶναι, δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἑμοὶ καὶ Βαρναβᾶ κοινωνίας. In his supposition that Peter and Paul hold differing views of the present task of the church and express this difference through a geographical partition, Munck scarcely mentions this statement in vs. 9. It is also ignored by Cullmann in his opinion that a decisive church split originates from the conference. Rather they concentrate entirely upon the distinctions between the ἀκροβυστία and the ἔθνη on the one hand and the περιτομή on the other, which appear in vss. 7,8 and in the ἵνα phrase of vs. 9. This exegesis disregards the fact that the material of vss. 7,8 and 9a is contained in participial clauses which denote the ground for the action of the main verb, and treats the phrase ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν without reference to its function as an apposition to the entire principal clause.¹ Thus grammatically as well as logically the fundamental thought that Paul seeks to communicate is that the pillar apostles gave to him the right hand of κοινωνία.

The primary factor which constrained the pillars to offer this κοινωνία was the outstanding performance of Paul's Gentile mission. They recognized that he had been entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision just as the gospel of the circumcision had been committed to Peter, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ἰδόντες ὅτι πεπιστευματὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς, vs. 7. As we

¹ Cf. H.E. Dana, J.R. Mantey, *op. cit.*, pp. 237, 249; E.D. Burton, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, pp. 91, 94-96; H. Schlier, *op. cit.*, pp. 45,46.

have noted, the distinction between the two gospels does not arise from differing interpretations of the significance of the resurrection as Fridrichsen maintains. On the other hand, there is more involved here than just a presentation of the gospel which is adapted according to the particular background and orientation of the audience. The main difference is that the gospel preached to Gentiles is free of the demands of the Jewish Law, while the gospel given to Jews carries the additional recommendation to continue in the Law as an established way of life.¹

Paul's parenthetical remark in vs. 8 represents his own explanation for the recognition of the pillars, ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρος εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς ἐνήργησεν καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη.² He was not able to legitimatize himself in their eyes by merely citing the divine origin of his commission, for the leaders of the primitive church believed that an intimate association with the historical Jesus was required of the apostle, Acts 1.21,22. That Paul's deficiency in this respect was used against him either by the pillars or more probably by the ψευδαδελφοί during the course of the conference is revealed by the caustic comment of vs. 6, where he depreciates the present importance of a former relationship with Jesus, ὅποιοι ποτε ἦσαν οὐδὲν μοι διαφέρει· πρόσωπον ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει.³

1 Cf. above, pp. 145-152.

2 P. Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates, pp. 41,42; H. Lietzmann, An die Galater, p. 236.

3 M. Luther, Epistle to the Galatians, no trans., p. 68, in his treatment of vs. 6, accurately defines the issue, "And this was one of the greatest arguments that the false apostles used against Paul. The apostles, said they, were familiarly conversant with Christ for the space of three years. They heard and saw all his preachings and miracles. Moreover, they themselves

Nevertheless the pillars are prepared to acknowledge Paul's unique call, for when confronted with the facts of his Gentile mission, they could not deny that God's power was evident. They did not accept Paul's claim to a personal revelation of Christ and then on this basis admit his special ministry. Rather they first endorsed his Gentile mission and only then were willing to accredit his apostolate.¹ This corresponds to Paul's practice of citing the fruits of his ministry, τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, II Cor. 12.12, in order to demonstrate his apostolic call, I Th. 1.5; I Cor. 2.4, 5; 9.1, 2; II Cor. 3.1, 2; 10.7, 18; 11.23ff; Ro. 15.18, 19. It also fits the Acts accounts of Paul's contacts with the Jerusalem leaders; he does not voice his claim to a divine commission, but is content merely to present the record of his work, Acts 15.4; 21.18, 19.

Furthermore this interpretation is confirmed by the second of the two participial clauses which determine the offering of κοινωνία by the pillars, καὶ γινόντες τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι, vs. 9a. From I Cor. 15.8-11 and Gal. 1.15, 16 we have seen that when Paul uses χάρις in the context of his apostolic ministry, he is not pinpointing God's action at the moment of conversion but designating the divine power manifesting itself at Damascus, taking possession of his life, and producing the miraculous results of his ministry. What the pillars recognised was the

preached and wrought miracles while Christ was yet living in the world; whom Paul never saw in the flesh, and as touching his conversion, it was long after the glorification of Christ." This view of vs. 6 is followed by J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 107, 108; G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, pp. 48, 49; H. Schlier, op. cit., pp. 42, 43 contra. H. Lietzmann, An die Galater, p. 235; Cf. above, pp. 124-127.

¹ C. v. Weizsäcker, op. cit., I, 101, 186; J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, 267, 268, 270.

χάρις by which Paul had outworked all of his colleagues in the apostolic mission, I Cor. 15.10.¹

Consequently it is improbable that in Gal. 2.7-9, Paul is presenting the two apostolates which are of decisive significance in the eschatological chain of events. This viewpoint, endorsed by both Munck and Fridrichsen, does not recognize that the accent in vss. 7-9 is not upon the divine call but upon the concrete results of the Gentile mission which constrain the apostles to concede Paul's call. In citing these results, Paul no doubt singles out Peter by way of comparison, since the latter had achieved the most notable success among the Jews, καθὼς Πέτρος τῆς περιτομῆς, vs. 7. "Therefore it is presumable that Paul's contrast here of his work and gospel with those of Peter is based on the fact that Peter had been the outstanding (not, the only) apostle (or theologian, or both) of the Jerusalem group. This argues that Paul claimed for himself no more

Cf. above, pp. 28, 29; Cf. also I Cor. 3.10; II Cor. 12.9; Ro. 1.5; 12.3; 15.15; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 291; J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, p. 109 attempts to distinguish between the ἰδόντες clause of vs. 7 and the γινόντες clause of vs. 9 claiming that the former involves a recognition of Paul's successful labours and the latter the resultant conviction that God's grace was with him. The distinction is strained however since Paul never detaches his successful labours from the operation of divine grace. E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 94,95 rightfully understands the two participial clauses as expressing the same idea. As H. Schlier, op. cit., 45 observes, "Gospel and grace are parallel here, in as much as the gospel is the word of grace." Thus although the emphasis in vs. 7 is upon εὐαγγέλιον and in vs. 9a upon χάρις, Paul's one intention throughout is to say that in his ministry the original apostles saw God at work.

than a similar pre-eminence not an exclusive competence."¹ Furthermore the pillars' offer of the right hand of *κοινωνία* vs. 9, which is the principal information that Paul intends to convey, involves not only Paul and Peter, but the other participants in the conference as well, Barnabas, James, and John.

The expression *δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν*, vs. 9, corresponds to numerous examples from the Greek classics, the LXX, and the papyri where *δεξιός* is used with verbs of giving and receiving to signify "assurance", "pledge", "treaty".² *κοινωνίας* is a descriptive genitive which defines the nature of the assurance, the content of the pledge, which the pillars give to Paul and Barnabas, *δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἑμοὶ καὶ Βαρναβᾶ κοινωνίας*, vs. 9. This usage of *κοινωνία* is remarkable since the word itself is not qualified by the usual genitive, dative or prepositional phrase which signifies the thing that is shared, e.g. *ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, I Cor. 1.9; *ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, I Cor. 10.16; *ἡ κοινωνία τῆς κίστεως*,

¹ M. Smith, "Pauline Problems," *Harvard Theological Review*, L (1957), 129, Parentheses Smith's; Thus also H. Lietzmann, *An die Galater*, p. 236; P. Gaechter, *op. cit.*, p. 385., Paul's particular allusion to Peter in I Cor. 9.5 can be explained in the same way; Cf. above, pp. 90, 172, 173.

² Xenophon, *Anabasis*, I 6.7 (Loeb, p. 298) is an illustration of the use of *δεξιός* with *λαμβάνω* and *δίδωμι* both, *καὶ δεξιὰν ἔλαβον καὶ ἔδωκα*. Vide., also the examples cited in H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, *op. cit.*, I, 378, 379. The word occurs frequently in the books of Maccabees to denote terms of reconciliation and peace that are exchanged between two opposing forces, I Macc. 6.58; 11.50, 62, 66; 13.50; II Macc. 11.26; Cf. also IV Kingdoms 10.15; II Esdras 10.19. Josephus, on one occasion uses *δεξιός* as a synonym for *πίστις*: *Vespasian delegated two tribunes, δεξιὰς τε τῷ Ἰωσήφῳ δοῦναι κελεύουσας*, and when they had contacted Josephus, *πίστεως καὶ σωτηρίας ἔδιδον*, Josephus, *De Bello Judaico* III 8.1, 2 (Dindorfius, II, 168). In addition to the usage with *λαμβάνω* and *δίδωμι*, *δεξιός* appears in the papyri with *τηρέω* and *φυλάσσω* with the sense, "to keep a pledge", *ἵνα τηρήσῃ αὐτὸν τὴν δεξιάν*, P. Oxy. III 533.18; *μὴ φυλάσῃν οὖν τὴν δεξιάν*, P. Fay, 124.13, J.H. Moulton, G. Milligan, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

Phlm. 6; ἡ κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, Phil. 1.5; ἡ κοινωνία πνεύματος, Phil. 2.1. In fact this is the only occasion in Paul's Epistles where κοινωνία is used absolutely, and this has led Seesemann, Hauck, and Lietzmann to give the general rendering "spiritual fellowship," ἡ κοινωνία Χριστοῦ. The pillars recognise Paul as a comrade ἐν Χριστῷ.¹

However Campbell has rightly seen that this interpretation does not go far enough. κοινωνία in vs. 9 is not so exceptional as it first appears, since the ἵνα clause, used as an appositive, reveals the kind of fellowship that the pillars contemplate, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν.² In the context of the missionary task Campbell maintains that κοινωνία has its usual significance of "participation" and in vs. 9 means "partnership", "going shares in an enterprise".³ Similarly Bonnard finds that the keyword for interpreting vs. 9 is κοινωνία, "which to Paul not only describes the spiritual communion with Christ or fellowship between believers, but the partnership in view of the missionary conquest."⁴

When we put the emphasis as Paul does upon the pillars'

1 H. Seesemann, Der Begriff KOINONIA im Neuen Testament, pp. 86,87; F. Hauck, "κοινωνός" T.W.N.T., III, 809; H. Lietzmann, An die Galater, p. 236.

2 A verb such as ἔλθομεν or εὐαγγελισώμεθα is to be mentally supplied.

3 J.Y. Campbell, "KOINONIA and Its Cognates in the New Testament," J.B.L., LI (1932), 353,373.

4 P. Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates, p. 43; Thus also J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, 268; E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, p. 96; G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, pp. 50,51. Cf. the use of κοινωνία in Phil. 1.5 and κοινωνέω in Phil. 4.15.

pledge of *κοινωνία* in the mission of the church, the basic contradiction in the viewpoints of Cullmann, Munck, and Fridrichsen are evident. Cullmann finds in Gal. 2.7-9 the creation of two independent missionary organizations, the one under Paul intended to concentrate upon Gentiles, the one under Peter directed primarily to the Jews. The difficulty with this position is that the original apostles would hardly have been willing either (1) to relinquish a responsibility for the Gentiles which, as Cullmann rightly insists, was assigned to them by the risen Christ, or (2) to commit this task to Paul, who, in Cullmann's view endorsed a concept of grace which they (with the exception of Peter) were never able to accept. This construction fails to heed the emphasis of Gal. 2.7-9, for what Cullmann has designated a basic church split, Paul calls *κοινωνία*.

Munck's view is equally questionable. If the Jerusalem leaders remained convinced that God intended the salvation of the Gentiles, only after the conversion of Israel, upon what grounds did they acknowledge that Paul was being used of God for the salvation of the Gentiles now? Either Paul is misrepresenting the results of the conference or Munck's thesis falls. For what Munck describes as two differing views of the sequence of salvation events which are expressed in a geographical division of the mission field, Paul calls *κοινωνία*.

No less objectionable in the light of Paul's emphasis are Fridrichsen's proposals for interpreting Gal. 2.7-9. According to this position Peter and the Jerusalem group are to be

distinguished from Paul, by a different view of the resurrection, by a belief that the Gentiles would only be redeemed following the parousia, by the restriction of their message to Palestine, but according to Paul the original apostles pledge their κοινωνία in his mission to the Gentiles.

If we are to take seriously the testimony of Gal. 2.7-9 the pillars' recognition of God's power in Paul's ministry must mean that they are convinced that Paul is accomplishing what God intended for this time. The pledge of κοινωνία reveals their belief that they themselves have been called to one task with Paul and Barnabas. "It is a 'union' or better yet 'a handshake between partners', through which two who have a share in the same cause agree with one another and confirm it."¹

In other words the apostles see that Paul's ministry is fulfilling the commission that Christ gave to them, Mt. 28.18-20; Acts 1.6-11.² In accordance with the evident call and gift of God, Paul is to continue his specialized work among the Gentiles, but in the knowledge that this work is now an officially recognized share in the task committed to all the apostles. Just as the

1 H. Schlier, op. cit., pp. 45,46 commenting upon Gal. 2.9.

2 This corresponds to the perspective of Luke in Acts 1.8. The authenticity of this commission is attested by its remarkable connection with the $\Gamma\Omega\psi$ concept of authority and relationship, (Cf. above, pp. 110-113). It is probable however that the phrase $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \iota\epsilon\rho\upsilon\sigma\alpha\lambda\eta\mu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\nu\ \kappa\acute{\iota}\nu\eta\ \tau\eta\ \iota\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\kappa\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\chi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ is a stylistic expansion of the original formula to conform to Luke's presentation of the growth of the church. E. Preuschen, op. cit., pp. 5,6; A.H. McNeile, op. cit., pp. 78-81. Nevertheless Luke reveals by this method that he regards Paul, Acts 13.28, as the one who predominantly fulfills the final phase of the apostolic commission.

original apostles fulfilled their obligation to Samaria through Philip, Acts 8.14-17, and their responsibility to Antioch through unnamed individuals from Cyprus and Cyrene, Acts 11.19-22, so now they fulfill their debt to the Gentiles through Paul and Barnabas. However there is the significant difference that while Samaria required the personal confirmation of the apostles and Antioch the verification of their official delegate, Paul, because of God's obvious blessing upon his work, is recognised as an apostle himself and therefore given equality and independence within the apostolic mission.

From this perspective we can see the importance of the decision of the conference for Paul's argument in Gal. 1, 2. He could not give clearer proof of the divine origin of his gospel and the full affirmation of his apostolate.¹ Of even greater significance is the fact that here in what is probably our earliest New Testament document we have striking evidence that the original apostles included the Gentile mission within their own present responsibility and that Paul was concerned to join his particular ministry to the total mission of the church.

¹ Thus O. Linton, op. cit., p. 94; K.H. Rengstorff, op. cit., p. 61; J. Wagenmann, op. cit., p. 49; contra, P. Gaechter, op. cit., pp. 420-424, who asserts that Paul's call is confirmed by the pillars when they mediate to him the authority they themselves received from Christ. This interpretation of Gal. 2.7-9 cannot stand in the context of Paul's thesis, Gal. 1.11,12.

VI

An Evaluation of Cullmann's Exegesis of II Thessalonians 2.6,7

Paul's desire to locate his work within the context of the apostolic mission is of vital importance when we examine the use which Cullmann and Munck have made of II Th. 2.6,7. In order to counter the impression held by some of the Thessalonians that the day of the Lord had come, II Th. 2.2, Paul reminds them of his recent stay when he gave instructions concerning the events which must transpire before the End, vs. 5. Notable among these will be the outbreak of ἀποστασία personified in ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας, vs. 3, who is being presently held in check by a restraining force, καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον οἶδατε, εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ καιρῷ, vs. 6. This force which assumes personal identity itself will continue its work until it is removed from the scene, τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας· μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται. Then for a period the lawless one is unleashed in all its diabolical power, but will be vanquished finally with the appearance of Christ, vss. 8-12.

Cullmann finds a setting for this passage in the Rabbinic debate over the factors which are retarding the dawn of the Messianic age לְבָרָכָהּ¹ This debate corresponds

¹ O. Cullmann, C.E., pp. 221-228. The Rabbis were divided on this question, some taking the view that the Messiah would not come before the culmination of religious decadence, others claiming that the new age must be preceded by Israel's repentance, while still a third group, disparaging such speculations, argued that the date was fixed by God and would come inevitably without reference to the condition of man. Vide. the thorough airing of the problem in Sanhedrin 97a, 97b, The Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin II, ed. I. Epstein, 644-651; Cf. also the discussion and references in H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, op. cit., III, 640, 641;

to the primitive Christian interest in the events which must precede the coming of the Messiah in glory. From Mk. 13.10; Mt. 24.14; 28.19; Acts 1.6ff; 3.19; 10.42; Rev. 6.1-8, Cullmann maintains that the early church saw the prior necessity of preaching the gospel and specifically the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles. This responsibility is τὸ κατέχον which holds back the revelation of the lawless one in II Th. 2.6; and, according to Cullmann ὁ κατέχων is the individual who personifies the task of the world mission, the one who is "the apostle to the Gentiles", namely Paul himself.¹

Cullmann claims that this exegesis of II Th. 2.6,7 "is absolutely conformable to the strict connection which he (Paul) establishes in the other epistles between his person and the divine plan relating to the destiny of the Gentiles."² As examples of this "strict connection" Cullmann particularly cites Ro. 9-11; Col. 1.22-29; Eph. 3.6 passages where Paul joins his own work to the μυστήριον whereby God is granting salvation to the Gentiles in the last days as a precursor to the conversion of Israel and the parousia of Christ.³

The value of Cullmann's article cannot be denied. His

G.F. Moore, op. cit., II, 350-354; P. Volz, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde, pp. 102-107, 138-147.

1 O. Cullmann, C.E., pp. 217-221; 229-235; Cf. above pp. 34, 35.

2 O. Cullmann, C.E., p. 241, also p. 244. Parentheses mine.

3 O. Cullmann, C.E., pp. 235-239.

research adds strong support to the contention that the mission to the Gentiles was included within the common vision of the primitive church rather than limited to a minority party or single individual. Moreover Cullmann has rightly seen and emphasized the fact that Paul interprets his vocation in the light of God's plan of salvation for the interval between the resurrection and parousia. Nevertheless by adopting this conception of II Th. 2.6,7 we attribute to Paul a consciousness which goes beyond and even contradicts his other statements in the Epistles. According to this view it is not the Gentile mission of the church which restrains but the particular ministry of Paul. Cullmann's position requires Paul to believe that his personal work alone constitutes God's salvation for the Gentiles, since it is the completion of this work and the death of the apostle, ὥς ἐκ μέσου γένηται, vs.7, that signals the final events.¹ Although Cullmann rightly insists that the other apostles (though lacking the intensity of Paul's consciousness) also join their mission to God's purpose in the last days, this is hardly consistent with his own exegesis. For only one can be ὁ κατέχων and if Paul assigns this role to himself, he assumes an exclusive and deterministic function. Thus Munck's view of Paul as the pre-eminent eschatological apostle though incorrect, at least applies Cullmann's interpretation of II Th. 2.6,7

1 Commenting upon the phrase ὥς ἐκ μέσου γένηται, Cullmann writes, "This would then be the death of the apostle Paul which, coincident with the end of the preaching to the Gentiles, would mark the decisive time for the manifestation of the Antichrist and the inauguration of the Messianic Age." O. Cullmann, C.E., pp. 242, 243.

consistently.¹

Galatians 2.7-9 demonstrates, however, that Paul does not regard himself as the Gentile mission personified. Rather this mission is exercised through a partnership with Barnabas and the pillars. He does not seek priority but equality within the apostolate, I Cor. 9.1-18; 15.1-11; II Cor. 10 - 13; Gal. 1.1-24.² We have seen too that, although Paul has a clearly defined concept of his own responsibility, he fits this responsibility into the context of the whole apostolic mission, I Cor. 4.8-11; Eph. 2.20. Furthermore this tendency is evident in two of the passages particularly, cited by Cullmann. (1) In Eph. 3.6 the *μυστήριον* through which Paul defines his own mission has also been revealed, *τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις*, vs. 5, and (2) in Col. 1.26 is manifest *τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ*.³ Finally when we examine Ro. 9-11 we shall see that Paul is vitally concerned with his own task, but he still does not attribute a superior significance to his ministry nor does he separate his activity from the total mission of the church.

Not only does Cullmann's exegesis oppose the general witness of the Epistles, but scholars such as Rigaux and Leichtenhan have seen that this view fails to harmonize with the particular situation underlying the Thessalonian correspondence.⁴ (I) If

1 Cf. above, pp. 75, 76.

2 Cf. above, pp. 76-101.

3 Cf. above, pp. 114-117.

4 B. Rigaux, *Les Épitres aux Thessaloniens*, *Études Bibliques*, pp. 276-277; R. Leichtenhan, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

Paul believes himself to be ὁ κατέχων, why does he refer to this responsibility with such vague, mysterious terminology when elsewhere in these two letters (and throughout his Epistles) he speaks specifically and precisely of his work, I Th. 1.5; 2.1,2, 9-12, 17, 18; 3.1,2; II Th. 3.1,2,7-10? (2) If the Thessalonians had been instructed that the revelation of ὁ ἄνθρωπος and the final appearance and victory of Christ depended upon so obvious and definite a factor as the completion of Paul's ministry and the death of the apostle, how, shortly after Paul's departure, could the impression have arisen in Thessalonica that the parousia of Christ had already taken place, II Th. 2.1-4? (3) Finally, how can we reconcile Paul's alleged conviction that his death precedes the outbreak of lawlessness before the parousia, with his firm expectation of being alive when Christ comes, I Th. 4.13-18? These arguments especially the second and third, expose the awkwardness of Cullmann's exegesis in the context.

Furthermore the specific connection of II Th. 2.6,7 with the rabbinic speculation over Messiah's appearance seems to overlook the firm belief of the early church that the Messiah had come. A more likely explanation is the thesis pioneered by Gunkel that II Th. 2.1-12 has its background in the apocalyptic visions of a final catastrophe followed by the victory of God.¹ "St. Paul starts from the fundamental thought of

1 H. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos, pp. 221-225; Cf. also G.F. Moore, op. cit., II, 370-377. Moore demonstrates that no sharp distinction can be drawn between the Rabbinic discussions over the Messiah and the final culmination of evil and triumph of God which originates in Apocalyptic Judaism but he nevertheless observes a tendency in the later apocalypses to locate the final crises after the Messianic age.

Jewish Apocalyptic that the end of the world will be brought about by the direct intervention of God when evil has reached its climax."¹

Thus many of the characteristic motifs of this literature are evident in the brief eschatological scheme of Paul's, II Th. 2.1-12: (1) The concentration and rebellion of the forces of evil in the last days is found throughout the apocalypses,² and reaches its crowning expression in the Dead Sea Scrolls, when in The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness, we receive a detailed description of the marshalling and deploying of the respective forces and the development of the actual conflict.³ (2) The personification of evil in figurative individuals appears with Behemoth and Leviathan,⁴ Belial,⁵

1 R.H. Charles, Eschatology, p. 438; Cf. also, H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, pp. 140-146; C.H. Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development," pp. 27, 28.

2 Vide. especially the chronological plan of Da. 8.23-25; 12.1-13 and the Apocalypse of Weeks, I Enoch 91.12-17 (A.P., II, 264, 265); Cf. also I Enoch 90.13-19 (A.P., II, 258); Sybilline Oracles III 46-52, 657-667 (A.P., II, 379, 380, 390); The same kind of crises is described in Rv. 16.14; 19.11-21 and in the Synoptic Apocalypse, Mt. 24.15-37. For an analysis of the numerous connections between II Th. 2.1-12 and Mt. 24.15-37, vide. H.A.A. Kennedy, St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things, pp. 218, 219.

3 1 Q.M. 1-19 (O.M.G.); Cf. also 1 Q.S. 4.9-26 (D.S.S., II.2); C.D. 7.9 - 8.21; 20.14-22 (Z.D.), pp. 28-37, 40, 41); 1 Q.H. 3.19-36 (O.M.G.).

4 I Enoch 60.1-24 (A.P., II, 223-225); IV Ezra 6.47-52; II Baruch 29.1-4 (A.P., II, 497).

5 Testament of Dan. 5.1-13 (A.P., II, 333-335); Sybilline Oracles III 63 (A.P., II, 380); Martyrdom of Isaiah 1.8.9 (A.P., II, 159); 1 Q.S. 2.19 (D.S.S., II.2); C.D. 4.12-19 (Z.D., pp. 15-17) 1 Q.M. 1.1 etc. (O.M.G.).

Azazel,¹ the Man of Falsehood etc.² (3) The most heinous offence which the apocalypses attribute to the rebellious forces is sacrilege, assuming the place of God and profaning the sacred objects in the Temple.³ (4) Frequently in the apocalyptic literature the evil power is operative but is held in check by some supernatural agent until the day appointed by God when it will be unleashed in all its demonic potential. Behemoth and Leviathan, formed on the fifth day of creation are preserved until the final conflict.⁴ The righteous priest who comes for a period of blessing before the end will bind Belial.⁵ Evidently the Qumran Community believed they were living in the days when Belial had been released to exercise his villainous purpose and they confidently expected to participate in his overthrow in the

1 Apocalypse of Abraham XIV, XXIX (The Apocalypse of Abraham, ed. and trans. G.H. Box, pp. 53-55, 77-82).

2 אֲזַזֵּל, C.D. 20.15 (Z.D., p. 40). Rabin, loc.cit., suggests that ἀνομιὰς τῆς ἀνομίας, II Th. 2.3, is a direct translation of this term. Cf. also ἀντίχριστος, I Jn. 2.18, 22; 4.3; II Jn. 7; τὸ ὄψλον, Rv. 13.11-18; 19.17-21; Gog. Rv. 20.8

3 The classic example is the abomination making desolate, דּוֹשָׁן קִרְיָא Da. 11.31; 12.11, which is usually connected with the desecration of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, I Macc. 1.20-64; II Macc. 5.15; Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae, XII 5.3,4. (Dindorfius, I, 457, 458). Thus R.H. Charles, Eschatology, pp. 125-127; H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, pp. 39-48. Cf. also Da. 8.11-13; 9.26,27; Psalms of Solomon 1.8 (A.P. II, 631); Sybilline Oracles III, 657-667 (A.P., II, 390); the reaction to Ptolemy's attempt to enter the Holy of Holies, III Macc. 1, 2; (Mt. 24.15; Acts 12.21; Rv. 11.2).

4 II Baruch 29.1-4 (A.P., II, 497); IV Ezra 6.47-52.

5 Testament of Levi 18.1-14 (A.P., II, 314, 315).

near future.¹ Examples of satanic forces that are divinely restrained and loosed are also numerous in the Book of Revelation.² (5) Finally, the apocalyptic references all envision the direct intervention of God at the height of the final conflict between good and evil, a factor which corresponds to Paul's expectation of the parousia of Christ, II Th. 2.8.³

Several competent scholars, with this Jewish apocalyptic speculation in mind, have attempted to identify τὸ κατέχον with the Roman empire and ὁ κατέχων with Emperor Claudius, A.D. 41-54.⁴

1 1 Q.S. 2.19; 4.9-26 (D.S.S., II:2); In C.D. 3.21 - 4.19 (Z.D., pp. 12-17) the Sons of Zadok are the elect of the last epoch during which Belial shall be let loose מִלְּפָנֵי הַיְּהוָה בְּיָמֵי הַמָּלְאָכִים; C.D. 4.12, 13 (Z.D., pp. 15-17); 1 Q.M. 13.1-18; 15.1-13 (O.M.G.); Cf. also, Y. Yadin, The Message of the Scrolls, pp. 128-130; J.T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, trans. by J. Strugnell, pp. 121-128; H.H. Rowley, Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 18, 19 who equates the 40 years which follow the death of the unique teacher, C.D. 20.14 (Z.D., pp. 40, 41) with the 40 years duration of the war, 1 Q.M. 2.6-14 (O.M.G.)

2 Rv. 7.1; 9.1, 13; 11.7; 20.1-3.

3 Cf. the material cited above, p. 196, nt. 2, and particularly the reference to God's coming to fight the rebellious nations, Zech. 14.3-5, καὶ ἔσται Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς μου, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ, vs. 5, (LXX); Cf. 1 Th. 3.13; T.H. Gaster, The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, p. 262, restores 1 Q.M. 1.15-17 (O.M.G.) according to this statement of Zech 14.5 principally on the basis of the three remaining words of 1 Q.M. 1.16 מִלְּפָנֵי הַיְּהוָה בְּיָמֵי הַמָּלְאָכִים. However, the condition of the text requires that the resulting translation be treated purely as a matter of conjecture (O.M.G., plate 16).

4 W. Bousset, The Antichrist Legend, trans. A.H. Keane, pp. 127-129; E. Dobschutz, Die Thessalonicher - Briefe, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, pp. 278-283; R.H. Charles, Eschatology, pp. 438-442; G. Milligan, "The Eschatology of II Thessalonians 2.1-12," Expositor, XII (1905), 99-118; A. Sabatier, op. cit., pp. 117-123.

This view corresponds with another feature of the apocalypses, namely that they generally arise out of the context of actual persons and events such as the desecration of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, 168 B.C.¹ However a problem develops when the further identification of ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας is attempted. Usually a reference is found here to the Jewish opposition encountered by Paul in the pursuit of his mission, I Th. 2.14-16, or to the lawless force represented in the desire of Caligula to exhibit his own image in the Holy of Holies, A.D. 41,² or even to the potential threat to Christianity latent in the young Nero.

However if we assume the Pauline authorship of II Thessalonians and thus date the epistle during Paul's sojourn in Corinth approximately A.D. 51,³ the concept of an evil power presently at work, eventually unleashed, and ultimately destroyed, must be strained in order to correspond to Caligula, an emperor who had been dead for ten years or to Nero, a fourteen year old boy who had given no indication of his future despotism. It is even more difficult to believe that the author of Ro. 9 - 11 could have assigned such a negative role to the Jews in this eschatological scheme, II Th. 2.1-12. Finally the connection of τὸ κατέχον with Rome is challenged by those who doubt whether Paul was so favourably disposed to the Roman

1 Cf. above, p. 197, nt. 3.

2 Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae, XVIII 8.3 (Dindorfius, I, 720).

3 Cf. below, Extended Note 3, p. 244.

government, notwithstanding his remarks in Ro. 13.1-7.¹

Other scholars have been content to locate the setting of the passage in Jewish apocalyptic without giving specific identification to the figures which Paul employs.² The vagueness of the apostle's allusions as well as the complexity of apocalyptic imagery certainly justify this caution. For the purpose of our discussion the important consideration is that ὁ κατέχων cannot be Paul. Such an interpretation violates the context of the Thessalonian correspondence, and contradicts the apostolic consciousness evident in all the other Epistles. Although it is true that Paul related his task to God's plan of salvation in the last days, he never claimed an exclusive and deterministic role in this drama. For he also related his task to that of the other apostles, and saw his work as a share in the total mission of the church.

VII

"The Fullness of the Gentiles" and "Representative Universalism"

Professor Munck, to a far greater extent than Cullmann and

1 For a comprehensive and critical analysis of the identification of the restraining thing with the Roman Empire and the restraining one with the Emperor, vide. H. Gunkel, op. cit., pp. 222-224; O. Cullmann, C.E., pp. 212-215; W. Neil, The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, pp. 166-169.

2. H. Gunkel, op. cit., pp. 221-225; M. Dibelius, An Die Thessalonicher, pp. 32-34; W. Neil, op. cit., pp. 165-173; B. Rigaux, op. cit., pp. 274-280, 663-671.

Fridrichsen, has applied his eschatological interpretation to the actual strategy and procedure of Paul's mission. He defines the goal of Paul's work as τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν, "The Fullness of the Gentiles". However, according to Munck, Paul has held three different conceptions of this goal during the course of his work. At the time of the Epistle to the Romans, coinciding with the favorable outcome of events in Corinth, τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν describes the spread of the Christian message throughout the world. It is not a specific number of Gentile converts that Paul envisions but rather representatives of all nations, who in turning to Christianity occasion the salvation of Israel, and the return of Christ.

Thus Paul's claim to have brought the gospel to completion from Jerusalem to Illyricum, ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κέκλω μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωμέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ro. 15.19, and to have no more opportunity in these regions, οὐκ ἔτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις, Ro. 15.23, means that the Gentiles who have accepted Christ represent the positive response of the entire area. "The Fullness of the Gentiles" is therefore a reality in the eastern Roman empire and Paul is free to go to the West in order to secure the faith of the Spaniards, Gauls, and Britons.¹

This concept of strategy which Munck has labelled "representative universalism" does not sufficiently explain certain

¹ Cf. above pp. 141, 142; J. Munck, P.H., pp. 39-48; 271-273; C.I., pp. 73-76; 99-102.

aspects of Paul's mission. (1) If Paul saw himself charged with the task of procuring a representation of believers from every nation in order to hasten the conversion of Israel and the parousia of Christ, we can understand why he approached his work with the urgency and speed that Munck emphasizes. We can also explain his satisfaction with the establishment of one main Christian center in Achaia (Corinth) and one in Asia (Ephesus). But, assuming Munck's position, it is difficult to understand why Paul took time at the risk of his life to found two communities in the region of Phrygia (Antioch, Iconium), two in Lycaonia (Lystra, Derbe), thus making four in the Roman province of Galatia, or similarly to establish three in Macedonia (Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea). (2) Paul's concern for the individual, his patient and persistent care of each community (which Munck has noted, P.H., pp. 47,48) suggests that he has a purpose beyond the positive reception of the gospel in each field of labour. Mere acceptance of Christ does not suffice. The communities are exhorted to be strengthened, confirmed, established in the faith: ἵστημι, I Th. 3.2,13; II Th. 2.17; 3.3; Ro. 1.11; κραταίω, I Cor. 16.13; Eph. 3.16; στήνω, I Cor. 16.13; δυναμιόω, Col. 1.11; θεμελιόω, Col. 1.23; βεβαίω, Col. 2.7. (3) That those who received the gospel were considered the representatives of those who had not heard, is negated by the sharp distinction that Paul draws between the members of Christ's body, οἱ ἔσω, and "those who are outside", οἱ ἔξω, I Th. 4.12; I Cor. 5.12,13; Col. 4.5; (I Ti. 3.7). (4) Finally

Paul feels himself responsible to all, Ro. 1.14; I Cor. 9.19-23. "He is 'a debtor' to Greek and barbarian, to every man for whom Christ died."¹ Living under such a compulsion it is not likely that Paul would have allowed the response of a few to release him from his obligation to minister to the vast majority.

On the other hand Munck is justified in rejecting the picture of Paul, the modern missionary strategist planting bases of Christianity in key locations in order to facilitate the systematic conquest of the Empire for Christ. Attention has rightly been called to the sense of strategy that undergirds Paul's mission. This is evident for example, in his attraction to large cities and his accommodation to the Roman provincial organization.² However in discarding the Luke-Acts concept of a missionary journey and enumerating the six successive centers that are chosen for the ordered spread of Christianity throughout the *oikoumenē*, Dibelius is one who has overstepped Paul's sense of strategy.³ Knox appears to be another who has gone beyond our sources when he compares Paul during

1 T.R. Glover, op. cit., p. 214; A. Schlatter, op. cit., p. 283 rightly observes that Paul contemplates a mission to all, even though he realises that the gospel will only be received by some.

2 C. Weizsäcker, op. cit., I, 229-235; A. Deissmann, Paul, pp. 227-229; J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, 280-281; C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, pp. 24, 25.

3 M. Dibelius, W.G. Kümmel, Paul, pp. 67-83. Dibelius lists (1) Damascus, (2) Tarsus, (3) Antioch, (4) Corinth, (5) Ephesus, and the proposed sixth center, (6) Rome. Cf. J.H. Ropes, The Apostolic Age, pp. 128, 129 who has likewise exaggerated this aspect of Paul's mission.

his sojourn in Ephesus to the Bishop of a large diocese, one whose primary task has transcended evangelism and has become administration, the management of a vast mission area through numerous assistants.¹ Thus we must reject Paul the master strategist and Paul the administrative Bishop as well as Paul the representative universalist.

The solution is found in the designation that the apostle applies to himself, Paul the σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων, I Cor. 3.10. As we have noted the responsibility of laying a foundation restricts Paul to areas where the gospel has not been preached,² and his consciousness of this constraint is clearly stated in the passage from which Munck derives his representative theory, ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωμέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. οὕτως δὲ φιλοτιμοῦμενον εὐαγγελίζεσθαι οὐκ ὅπου ἄνομία ἐστι Χριστός, ἵνα μὴ ἐκ' ἑτέρου θεμελίον οἰκοδομῶ, Ro. 15.19,20. We can therefore conclude that Paul's mission from Jerusalem to Illyricum was impelled neither by a principle of representative universalism, nor a master plan for covering the Empire, but by a divine appointment to a pioneer mission. Paul's having no more room in this area of 300,000 square miles, νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόπον ἔχον ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τοῦτοις, vs. 23, indicates that, in his mind, there were no remaining frontiers which required the laying of an additional foundation.³

1 J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, pp. 102-104.

2 Cf. above, pp. 44-52, 178-180.

3 Cf. D.W. Riddle, Paul, Man of Conflict, pp. 83, 84.

However, if we are to fully grasp Paul's meaning, it is necessary to focus upon a closely related aspect of his consciousness. Just as a foundation implies a building, so in each community Paul envisioned a further work beyond his own. He speaks of the growth of the building whose corner stone is Jesus Christ, ἐν ᾧ πᾶσα οἰκοδομὴ συναρμολογουμένη αὐξάνει εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον ἐν κυρίῳ, Eph. 2.21. The construction from the foundation to the completed temple of God is also the theme of I Cor. 3.5-17. This growth is associated with the advance of the gospel through the world, Col. 1.6, and the increasing membership of the body of Christ, Col. 2.19.

Thus in Paul's mind his own preliminary work is joined to the further task which he assigns to the community itself, namely the job of spreading the news of Christ throughout the surrounding country.¹ He tells the Corinthians that as their faith grows his sphere of activity in their area will be enlarged, ἐλπίδα δὲ ἔχοντες ἀξανανομένης τῆς κτιστικῆς ὑμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν μεγαλυνθῆναι κατὰ τὸν κανόνα ἡμῶν εἰς περισσεύαν, II Cor. 10.15, with the result that he will be free to pioneer the gospel in lands beyond, εἰς τὰ ὑπερέκεινα ὑμῶν εὐαγγελισοῦσθαι, οὐκ ἐν ἑλλοτρίῳ κανόνι εἰς τὰ ἔτοιμα καυχῆσθαι, vs. 16.² Therefore, although Paul's commission continually directs him to the frontiers and prevents his preaching

1 J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, 358, 359; C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, p. 41.

2 Thus H. Lietzmann, Korinther I, II, p. 142 writes, "With the κατὰ τὸν κανόνα ἡμῶν there is a reference to the expansion of the mission field; therefore the text concerns an actual growing, not merely a growth of esteem in the eyes of the Corinthians." Thus also E. Käsemann, op. cit., p. 60.

in every city along the way, his coverage of each field is still comprehensive rather than representative, because the individual communities themselves become the agents for extending his mission.¹

We have seen that Paul's communities actively share in his ministry by prayer, I Th. 5.25; II Th. 3.1; and by contributing support in the form of assistants or funds, I Cor. 16.6; II Cor. 1.16; Phil. 1.5; 4.15; (Ro. 15.24).² But in addition they are to undertake a missionary work of their own. The appointments and gifts which Paul regards as divinely bestowed upon the church, ἀποστολοι, προφηται, διδασκαλοι, δυνάμεις, etc. I Cor. 12.28; (Eph. 4.11) can only be fulfilled when each community accepts the obligation to spread its faith abroad.³

That this actually occurred is evident throughout the Epistles and Acts. From Thessalonica the word sounded forth in Macedonia and Achaia and everywhere, I Th. 1.7,8. Our first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians is addressed to the church at Corinth, I Cor. 1.2, while the second is addressed to the church at Corinth together with all the saints who are in the whole of Achaia, οὖν τοῖς ἁγίοις πάντων τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ, II Cor. 1.1. During Paul's two year stay in Ephesus all the inhabitants of Asia heard the gospel, both Jews

1 Vide. Extended Note 7 at the end of Part Three.

2 Cf. above, p. 48, nt. 1.

3 R. Liechtenhan, op. cit., pp. 88, 89.

and Greeks, Acts 19.10. The Epistle to the Colossians written to a church which Paul did not personally found, is a witness to the accuracy of this statement, and so also is the Epistle to the Ephesians itself, if like Abbott, J.A. Robinson, and Lueken, we regard the letter as an encyclical intended for the Christian communities throughout the Province.¹ Paul's comprehensive viewpoint is revealed when he refers to the house of Stephanas as the ἀρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας, I Cor. 16.15, and in the same way he designates Ephraenetus the ἀρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας, Ro. 16.5. Finally when the collection for the Jerusalem church is complete, it is not considered the contribution of the foundation churches established by Paul, but the gift of the Christians from the four great provinces which the gospel has covered, Galatia, I Cor. 16.1, Asia, Acts 20.4, Macedonia, and Achaia, Ro. 15.26.²

1 T.K. Abbott, Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, I.C.C., pp. VIII, IX; J.A. Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, pp. 11-13; W. Lueken, Die Briefe an Philemon, an die Kolosser und an die Epheser, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, pp. 348, 349. Cf. also Col. 4.15 and the description of Asian churches in Rv. 2.1 - 3.22.

2 This presupposes (1) that Acts 20.3,4 records names of those appointed by the churches to deliver the collection and (2) that the original reading in Acts 20.4 is ἀσβατοῦς as in the Nestles text rather than ἀσβεστός which is attested by D*. Thus the author cites Gaius and Timothy as the representatives of Galatia. F. Rendall, "The Pauline Collection for the Saints," Expositor, VIII (1893), 328-334; G.S. Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, pp. 236-249; Cf. J. Munck, P.H., pp. 286-292.

VIII

"The Fullness of the Gentiles"

and the Offering for the Church of Jerusalem

This brings us to the second conception of τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνων which Munck ascribes to Paul. "The Fullness of the Gentiles" is constituted by the delegates of the Gentile churches who take the collection to Jerusalem. Munck rejects Holl's idea that the offering is a tax imposed by the Mother Church upon its Gentile subsidiaries.¹ Furthermore the view that sees in the collection a grand ecumenical gesture is insufficient to explain certain circumstances which Munck notes, namely the size and expenses of the group which Paul appoints to deliver the money and the risk involved in the apostle's own determination to accompany them, Ro. 15.30,31; Acts 20.3, 22-25.

Munck finds the explanation in the O.T. prophecies which describe the nations of the Gentiles streaming to Mt. Zion with their praise and offerings to God, Is. 2.2-5; 25.6-8; 60; Jer. 16.19; Mi. 4.1-7; Zech. 14.16; Ps. 22.28-30.² He relates this prophetic strain to the perspective of Paul in Ro. 11, where the conversion of the Gentiles is said to provoke the jealousy of the Jews and lead to their salvation. "It is his object to save the Jews, in that he makes them jealous of the Gentiles who receive the gospel in greater number."³ "Paul

1 Vide the summary of this aspect of Munck's position above, pp. 140-141.

2 Cf. above, pp. 153-156.

3 J. Munck, P.H., p. 298.

goes up to Jerusalem seeking to occasion the great turning point in the life of his people in that he brings with him a representation out of 'The Fullness of the Gentiles'.¹

Munck's criticism of Holl's position is well founded. Exegetically Holl bases his argument on the identification of *πτωχοί* with *ἄγιοι*, taking both terms as technical designations for the Jerusalem community. Thus when Paul speaks of collecting money for the *πτωχοί*, Gal. 2.10; Ro. 15.26, or for the *ἄγιοι*, I Cor. 16.1; II Cor. 8.4; 9.1,12; Ro. 15.25,31, the reference in neither case is to a voluntary offering for the relief of material need, but to a compulsory payment in acknowledgement of the spiritual primacy of the Mother Church. The pitfall of this construction is Ro. 15.26 where Paul speaks of a contribution "for the poor among the saints at Jerusalem", *εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ*.² At this point Holl can only say that Paul, not fully sympathizing with the Jerusalem church and somewhat ashamed of his own part in the project, employs a deceiving expression which veils the true significance of the offering.³ However as Munck remarks, "It seems more probable to me that Holl is wrong with his assumption, than that Paul made himself guilty of falsehood in these matters."⁴

1 J. Munck, *C.I.*, p. 91.

2 *τῶν ἁγίων* can hardly be interpreted otherwise than as a Partitive Genetive. Thus A.T. Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 502.

3 K. Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 59; also H. Schlier, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

4 J. Munck, *P.H.*, p. 283; J. Wagenmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 40,41 rejects Holl's argument on similar grounds.

Munck accordingly takes ἅγιοι as an abbreviated form of πτωχοὶ τῶν ἁγίων so that Paul's expression, "an offering for the saints", refers merely to the poor saints. A third possibility which appears more consistent with Ro. 15.26 is to take ἅγιοι as a general (not technical) designation for the Jerusalem Christians and πτωχοὶ as a term citing the materially needy members of this community. Paul's reference to an offering for the saints, I Cor. 16.1 etc., corresponds to his particular concept of the body of Christ where "If one member suffers, all suffer together; if one member is honored, all rejoice together," I Cor. 12.26; Cf. also II Cor. 9.13.

Therefore Paul is not complying with a demand forced upon him by the Mother Church, II Cor. 9.5. Rather he is seeking to relieve material poverty. "That the inhabitants of Jerusalem were needy and that the offering was designated for the poor of this community is the self-evident presupposition of the whole work."¹ If the conference of Gal. 2.1-10 is identified with the Famine Visit, Acts 11.27 - 12.25,² one requires no further explanation for the conditions which occasioned the pillars' request that Paul continue his remembrance

¹ H. Windisch, Der zweite Korintherbrief, p. 246. Accordingly the background of the collection is not to be found in the Temple Tax, contr. G.S. Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, pp. 42-45, nor in the Jewish concept that the πτωχοὶ, the ד'י'י'י'י', are the particularly righteous members of the community, viz. the ἅγιοι, contr. K. Holl, op. cit., p. 60; H. Lietzmann, Korinther I, II, p. 89, but in the emphasis upon benevolence to the poor which occurs repeatedly throughout all the Jewish literature. Cf. G.F. Moore, op. cit., II, 162-179.

² Cf. Extended Note 3, p. 244.

of the poor, μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύσμεν, Gal. 2.10.¹ Evidence can be cited from the Egyptian papyri, as well as from Pliny and Josephus in order to accredit the reference in Acts 11.28 to a world-wide famine during the reign of Claudius.² Apparently this critical situation persisted in Jerusalem, particularly in the Christian community there. In Js. 2.6,7; 5.1-6; Hb. 10.32-36; 12.6, sources which are taken to reflect the circumstances of the Jerusalem church, Allo notes the emphasis upon the oppression of the rich and the sufferings of the poor, and from this he argues convincingly that the Christians in Jerusalem endured unremitting economic persecution.³ Undoubtedly it was this factor more than the failure of Christian Communism, Acts 4.32-37, which fostered conditions of poverty throughout the period

1 The pres. subj. μνημονεύσμεν probably signifies that "the course of action referred to is one which having already been begun is to be continued..." E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, p. 99. However on the basis of the aor. ἐκοιτίσθαι in the following phrase, ὃ καὶ ἐκοιτίσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, Gal. 2.10, Burton argues that "a reference to an effort on behalf of the poor at that very time in progress is impossible...", Ibid., p. 100. This interpretation is countered by G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, p. 52 who maintains that the aorist ἐκοιτίσθαι implies the instigation of the relief-work in the past in Antioch. Cf. R.A. Lipsius, op. cit., p. 27. It could also express Paul's personal reaction at the time when the pillars made the request.

2 Pliny, Naturalis Historia, V 57,58 (Loeb, II, 262, 264); Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae, XX 2.5 (Dindorfius, I 772, 773). For evidence from the Egyptian papyri vide. K.S. Gapp, "The Universal Famine under Claudius," Harvard Theological Review, XXVIII (1935), 258-265.

3 E.B. Allo, "La Portée de la Collecte pour Jérusalem dans les Plans de Saint Paul," Revue Biblique, (1936), pp. 529-531.

of Paul's collection.¹

However if Holl's position has a questionable exegetical foundation,² Munck's peculiar viewpoint on the collection suffers even more for lack of support. Paul more than once presents his idea of the significance of the offering, II Cor. 8.13-15; 9.11-15; Ro. 15.25-27, but nowhere in all his Epistles does he connect this offering with the O.T. prophecies concerning the Gentiles streaming with their gifts to Mt. Zion. Munck can only produce Acts 26.6,7 where Paul tells King Agrippa that he is standing trial "for hope in the promise made by God to our fathers" and Acts 28.20 where he informs the Jews in Rome that he is in chains "because of the hope of Israel."³

However, Acts 26.8 reveals that Paul is referring to the specific hope of the resurrection of the dead, an interpretation which Munck avoids by suggesting that vs. 8 is out of context and is to be inserted before vs. 23. Against Munck's opinion scholars are virtually unanimous in connecting Acts 26.6-8; 28.20 with Acts 23.6 and 24.21 where Paul cites the resurrection as the real issue of his trial,⁴ an argument which is probably founded on the apostle's view "that denial of the

1 F. Rendall, op. cit., p. 321; A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, I, 227, 228.

2 Vide. Extended Note 8 at the end of Part Three.

3 J. Munck, P.H., 298, 299.

4 B. Weiss, Apostelgeschichte, p. 310; E. Preuschen, Die Apostelgeschichte, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, pp. 145, 158; and especially K. Lake, H.J. Cadbury, Translation and Commentary, The Beginnings of Christianity, IV, 288, 289 who have traced a parallelism of both thought and language through these verses. Cf. also Acts 13.32, 33; 24.15; 25.19; 26.22, 23.

resurrection of Christ is a denial of the general resurrection."¹ Besides the reference to these passages in Acts, Munck maintains that his interpretation of the collection illumines certain difficult verses in Ro. 9 - 11, viz. Ro. 9.1-5, 26; 10.10, but he could be accused of a circular exegesis at this point since he originally derives his interpretation of the collection from the relationship between the Gentiles and the Jews that he finds in Ro. 9 - 11.²

Not only does Munck's view lack an exegetical foundation but it also suffers from two major contradictions. First it contradicts Munck's own idea of the object of Paul's mission. Up to this point the *κλήρομα τῶν ἐθνῶν* has signified a representative response to the gospel in all the nations, Ro. 15.19, but suddenly and without explanation Paul sees the delegates from four provinces in the eastern Mediterranean as "The Fullness of the Gentiles", and the means to Israel's conversion Ro. 15.25 (!). Secondly it contradicts Ro. 15.17-29 which is an expression of Paul's perspective immediately before his trip to Jerusalem. If Paul believed that the Gentile representatives would induce the culmination of history, the parousia of Christ, and the salvation of Israel, how, after the delivery of the offering, vss. 23.29, could he envision a visit to Rome and the opening of a new mission field in Spain? In an attempt to account for these contradictions, Munck says that "all eschatological points of time are uncertain and it is difficult for the one who

1 Ibid., p. 316.

2 J. Munck, P.H., cf. p. 298 with pp. 300-302.

lives and acts in the last times to determine exactly in which eschatological point of time he finds himself. Likewise an idea like the 'Fullness of the Gentiles' is not quite clear."¹ However this does not resolve the contradiction. Rather Munck has taken the confusion created by his own theory and attributed it to Paul.

Nevertheless, even though Munck's own position is not convincing, he has rightly emphasized the tremendous importance which the collection had for Paul, an importance evident in the risks which the Apostle assumes, and in the size and expense of the Gentile delegation appointed to deliver the money. According to Munck these circumstances are not fully explained by the view that Paul fulfilled an ecumenical purpose with the offering. But in dividing the Christian mission between Peter and Paul, Munck has failed throughout, to see the crucial importance which Paul attached to the unity of the church. A man who considered his mission to be in vain apart from this unity, Gal. 2.1,2 would be prepared to make any sacrifice in order to strengthen the ties binding the body of Christ in one. The majority of scholars who, with individual variations, have found an ecumenical intention in Paul's collection are therefore on strong ground.²

1 J. Munck, P.H., p. 299.

2 A. Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Centuries, I, 228, 229; M. Dibelius and W.G. Kummel, Paul, pp. 92-95, 130, 131, 155, 156; J. Wagenmann, op. cit., pp. 40, 41; F. Rendall, op. cit., pp. 331-336; W.M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, pp. 287, 288, 296; W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 284-287; B.H. Streeter, The Primitive Church, pp. 47-49; C.H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, p. 154; J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, pp. 53, 54.

Particularly in examining Paul's own descriptions of the offering, a purpose beyond the relief of the Jerusalem poor becomes manifest. It is of great significance that the collection is requested at the Jerusalem Conference, Gal. 2.1-10, and is included in the agreement by which the original apostles, and Paul and Barnabas pledge their *κοινωνία* in the common cause of the church, vs. 7-10. Thus the collection is not as Cullmann believes the one connecting link in a divided mission.¹ Rather Bonnard has accurately interpreted the context of Gal. 2.7-10 when he says that the request for the offering "was probably not a demand of principle, but the result of the partnership described in vs. 9, the recognised seal of a common agreement in this partnership."²

It is also of great significance that in the two passages which most fully convey the meaning of this gesture, Paul employs the word *κοινωνία* to designate the collection.³ (1) Describing the benefits that accrue to the participants in the fund, II Cor. 9.11,12, he tells the Corinthians that God will be glorified "by the generosity of your contribution for them and for all others;" ἀποδοτε τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς πάντας, vs. 13. *κοινωνία* here obviously transcends the idea of a monetary contribution since the Corinthians can hardly be giving money

1 O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, p. 43.

2 P. Bonnard, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates, p. 43; Thus also J. Wagenmann, op. cit., p. 41.

3 Cf. also χάρις, II Cor. 8.4, 6, 7, 19; εὐλογία II Cor. 9.5; διακονία, II Cor. 8.4; 9.1, 12, 13; Ro. 15.25,31; λειτουργία, II Cor. 9.12; Ro. 15.27; words which express the religious as well as the monetary significance of the offering.

εἰς πάντα. But it is precisely through the gift of money that they express their communion with the church in Jerusalem and throughout the world, so that κοινωνία used as a synonym for the collection has in addition its usual sense of "participation", "fellowship" in Christ, cf. vs. 14.¹ (2) In Ro. 15.26 Paul speaks of the contribution of Macedonia and Achaia, ἡβδόμησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιῆσαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἀγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ. From the context it is evident once again that more is involved than the relief of the poor. The offering expresses the gratitude of the Gentiles for their participation in the common faith which has been extended to them from Jerusalem, "for if the Gentiles have come to share (ἐκοινωνήσαν) in their spiritual blessings, they ought also to be of service to them in material blessings," vs. 27.² Thus Paul's ultimate intention with the offering is to demonstrate the communion in Christ which unites Jew and Gentile in one church.

IX

"The Fullness of the Gentiles" and Paul's Witness before Caesar

The third concept of "The Fullness of the Gentiles" which Munck attributes to Paul arises out of the events which follow

1 H. Lietzmann, Korinther I - II, pp. 137, 138; A. Schlatter, op. cit., p. 610.

2 C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, pp. 231, 232.

the apostle's failure to achieve his purpose with the collection. His arrest, trial, and prolonged imprisonment in Caesarea and Rome are in Munck's view a source of frustration and bitter disappointment, for with Paul's Gentile mission checked, the return of Christ and the salvation of Israel are delayed. However Paul eventually realises that his situation offers an opportunity to achieve his goal: "...precisely through the imprisonment, the court proceedings and the martyrdom, the possibility presents itself that the preaching of the word before Caesar will reach to all the Gentiles. Thus the dying apostle will see his work completed, in that the Fullness of the Gentiles produces the salvation of all Israel, and this was the hope which stirred Paul most strongly. Now is salvation near and the coming of Christ is at hand."¹

To illumine the significance of Paul's imprisonment and death, Munck has assembled a vast collection of papyri concerning Alexandrian citizens who plead their case and assert their views before Caesar. A few illustrations are also chosen from the O.T. and from the Maccabean literature in which individuals express themselves frankly to high officials and kings. Furthermore Munck emphasizes the importance which the gospel writers attribute to Christ's appearance before the authorities, and the similar interest shown by Acts in the cases of Peter, John, Stephen, and particularly of Paul himself. Mt. 10.18-20 and Mk. 13.9-11 are cited to show how the Synoptic

1 J. Munck, P.H., p. 329; cf. above pp. 141, 142.

eschatology gives a prominent place in the final events to the witness before governors and kings. When Munck, in the strength of all this source material, finally turns to the Epistles, he is able to advance a convincing argument for the fact that Paul joined his imprisonment to the cause of the gospel and considered his testimony to Caesar a momentous event in the Gentile mission, Phil. 1.7-18; II Tim. 4.16,17. Nevertheless Munck leaves these sources far behind with his further assertion that Paul regarded this testimony as "The Fullness of the Gentiles", the means of Israel's conversion, and the precursor of Christ's return.

In II Tim. 4.16,17 Paul reports that he received support from no one at his first defense. But he was sustained by the Lord so that the gospel might be fully proclaimed and all the Gentiles might hear it, ὁ δὲ κύριός μοι παρέστη καὶ ἐνεδυνάμωσέν με, ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληροφορηθῇ καὶ ἀκοῦσων πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, vs. 17. This combination of Paul's defense, the full proclamation of the gospel, and the hearing of all the Gentiles appears to support Munck's contention, but it must be recognised that these verses belong to one of the most controversial sections of the New Testament. (1) There is first the question of authorship. Although critics of the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals generally admit this fragment, II Tim. 4.6-22,¹ a competent scholar like Eduard Meyer is still prepared to deny its authenticity altogether.²

1 Cf. above, p. 53, nt. 3.

2 E. Meyer, op. cit., III, 492, 493.

(2) Assuming that II Tim. 4.6-22 is a genuine fragment (or fragments) of Paul's, there remains a vigorous debate over the imprisonment and trial to which the apostle refers. Duncan defends the hypothesis that these verses stem from Laodicea while Paul was in custody there.¹ Other scholars connect II Tim. 4.16,17 to Acts 22.1; 23.11 and thus find the background of the statement in the Caesarean confinement.² A third group hold that Paul writes at the close of his Roman imprisonment and alludes to the first part of his trial.³ Still others locate II Tim. 4.16,17 in a second Roman imprisonment and take the account of the πρώτη ἀπολογία as evidence of Paul's release from his first detention in Rome.⁴ A fifth position accepts this connection to the second Roman imprisonment but refers the πρώτη ἀπολογία to the proceedings of the same confinement.⁵

(3) Finally there are divergent applications of the purpose clause, ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληροφορηθῇ καὶ ἀκούσωσιν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, vs. 17, which correspond to the respective views above. For instance, Dibelius who connects II Tim. 4.16,17

1 G.S. Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, pp. 184-216.

2 P.N. Harrison, op. cit., pp. 121, 122; M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, p. 163, who also recognizes the possibility of relating II Tim. 4.16,17 to the Roman imprisonment.

3 E.F. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, pp. 140, 141.

4 F. Kohler, Die Pastoralbriefe, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, pp. 432, 433; Cf. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity, I, p. 392.

5 N.J.D. White, The First and Second Epistles to Timothy, The Expositor's Greek Testament, IV, p. 182.

with the Caesarean detention, applies these words to Paul's opportunity to preach in Rome.¹ A reference to the plan to evangelize Spain and the West is found by those who believe that Paul is reporting his release from a first Roman imprisonment.² Scholars defining the πρώτη ἀπολογία as a preliminary hearing in the trial that condemns Paul to death, generally take the ἵνα clause to describe the opportunity for preaching the gospel which this hearing afforded. Thus the words could express the size of the audience, the nations represented by those present, or the impact of Paul's testimony and the consequent spread of the gospel.³

Even if one concedes the controversial presuppositions of Munck's argument, namely that II Tim. 4.16,17 is written by Paul, stems from the one Roman imprisonment, and refers to the apostle's witness at a preliminary session of his last trial, there are still decisive reasons for opposing Munck's conclusion that Paul regarded this occasion as "The Fullness of the Gentiles".

1 M. Dibelius, An Timotheus II. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, p. 200.

2 Cf. I Clement 5.5-7 (A.F., p. 8); Thus Eusebius, Historiae Ecclesiasticae, II, 22 (P.G., XX, 193, 196); T. Zahn, op. cit., II, 1-27; F. Kohler, op. cit., pp. 432, 433.

3 P.C. Spicq, Les Épitres Pastorales, Études Bibliques, p.395 and F.D. Gealy "The Exegesis of the First and Second Epistles to Timothy," The Interpreters Bible, XI, 518, 519, regard the ἵνα phrase as hyperbole; Cf. N.J.D. White, op. cit., p. 182; Cf. also Moffatt's translation, "But the Lord supported me and gave me strength to make a full statement of the gospel, for all the heathen to hear it,..." E.F. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, p. 140; However, Scott himself finds an expression of Paul's hope to be released and to complete his world-wide mission, pp. 141f.

It is incredible that Paul achieved the objective of over twenty years work, and then devoted only one phrase to describe it. Can we believe that he would give as much space to instructions about his cloak, books and parchments, vs. 13, and more emphasis to a warning about Alexander the coppersmith, vss. 14,15 than he would to the occurrence which produces the conversion of Israel and signals the return of Christ? Yet the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ at the end of vs. 18 reveals that his statement is complete.

Furthermore Paul is describing an incident in the past. How could he have considered this incident "The Fullness of the Gentiles", when obviously neither the salvation of Israel nor the parousia of Christ had taken place? There is not even an indication that these events were anticipated. In fact they are not mentioned at all. Besides the effect of his testimony on the growth of the gospel, the only result which has impressed Paul is his temporary release, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ἐπεβόησεν ἐκ στόματος λέοντος, vs. 17 (cf. also vs. 18), and the only expectation for the future is the coming of Timothy and the apostle's own death, vss. 6-9. Therefore II Tim. 4.16-18 demonstrates that Paul saw his witness before Caesar as a crowning achievement in the advance of the gospel, Acts 23.11; 27.24, but hardly supports the view that he equated this achievement with "The Fullness of the Gentiles".

Nothing more than this can be claimed for Phil. 1.7-18. Munck finds an indication in these verses of Paul's perspective during his detention in Rome.¹ Although his missionary activity

¹ In his presupposition that Philipians is to be traced to Rome, Munck again takes a controversial view. G.S. Duncan, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, pp. 77-78, 141-161, 271-297, presents the case for the Ephesus location; Cf. also A. Deissmann, Paul, pp. 17,18. E. Lohmeyer, Die Briefe an die Philliper an die

is thwarted, the apostle realises that his imprisonment and trial have been determined by God for "the defense and confirmation of the gospel," Phil. 1.7.¹ However there is no evidence in this Epistle that Paul, through his witness before Caesar, expected to occasion "The Fullness of the Gentiles", the salvation of Israel and the return of Christ. From the images that he uses to describe his work, it is evident that his vocational consciousness at this time fits the pattern that is common to all the Epistles. Paul, though a prisoner in Rome, is running with his eyes upon the prize, Phil. 2.16; 3.14; he is preparing for the offering of his Gentile communities on the day of the Lord, even though his own life may be poured as an oblation upon this sacrifice, Phil. 2.16,17.²

In the very passage that Munck cites, Phil. 1.7-18, we receive the clearest confirmation that the Gentile mission was not identified in Paul's mind with the course that he himself ran and the offering he prepared, but was rather a task that transcended his own particular responsibility. Through his imprisonment other Christians had been encouraged to a bolder proclamation of the word and Paul had welcomed this advance of the gospel despite the fact that some of the individuals

Kolossier und an Philemon, pp. 1-4, argues for Caesarea. Nevertheless the Roman origin for the Epistle still provides the best explanation for the issues involved. E.F. Scott, "Exegesis of Philippians," pp. 5-8 and esp. F.W. Beare, The Epistle to the Philippians, B.N.T.C., pp. 15-24; Cf. also C.H. Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development," pp. 9-26 for a defense of the Roman location against Duncan's hypothesis.

¹ J. Munck, P.H., pp. 317-321.

² Cf. above, pp. 52-59.

concerned were antagonistic to him, vss. 12-18.¹ It is this picture of the apostle in chains, and yet rejoicing as the faith spreads through the witness of others, that shatters the theory that Paul saw himself personally responsible for "The Fullness of the Gentiles".²

X

The Apostolic Ministry, the Mission of Paul
and "The Fullness of the Gentiles" in Romans 9 - 11

It might appear overly critical to reject all three interpretations of τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν which Munck attributes to Paul

1 J. Munck, P.H., pp. 317-319, has rightly observed that these words cannot be taken as evidence of a basic split in the Roman church, nor of the existence of a Judaizing teaching. Rather the conflict centers upon the regard of these persons for Paul and the interpretation which they place upon his imprisonment. Thus also F.W. Beare, The Epistle to the Philippians, pp. 59, 60; E.F. Scott, "Exegesis of Philippians," pp. 31-33.

2 Commenting upon Paul's words in vs. 18, E. Lohmeyer, Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Colosser und an Philemon, p. 47, writes, "... he knows his own life and work as an impulse in the great movement which has begun to take the gospel through the world." Lohmeyer then defines the principle upon which this thought is based. "In other words the preaching of Christ is substantiated in its own particular way. Though it requires an earthen vessel, it does not become effective through the personal force of this vessel, but through the divine power of its own essence and its own fullness", p. 48. Cf. also G. Sass, op. cit., p. 87; F.W. Beare, The Epistle to the Philippians, p. 61.

in the course of the Apostle's mission. However, although each of these interpretations has been treated separately, it must be recognised that only one view of Paul's apostolate and mission has been protested. For the presuppositions which underlie each interpretation are identical, namely that Paul plays an exclusive role among the apostles and that his mission has a determinative relation to "The Fullness of the Gentiles", the conversion of Israel, and the return of Christ. "In this manner Paul as the apostle of the Gentiles becomes the central figure in the Heilsgeschichte. While the apostles, who were sent to the Jews had to say in the end: 'Lord, who has believed our message?', Ro. 10.16, the Gentiles accept the gospel where Paul preaches. And the witness of God's saving work will arouse the jealousy of the Jews and thus have the effect that Jews as well as Gentiles will become obedient to God. 'The Fullness of the Gentiles' which is Paul's goal is the decisive turning point in the Heilsgeschichte. With it Israel's salvation and the coming of antichrist begin and through this the coming of Christ for judgement and salvation, and thus the end of the world."¹ We have observed these same presuppositions arising out of Munck's exegesis of Gal. 2.7-9, and deciding his adoption of Cullmann's view of II Th. 2.6,7.

Finally this viewpoint is applied to Ro. 9-11. Munck's detailed exposition of these three chapters, Christus und Israel, contributes valuable insight into the problem encountered by early

¹ J. Munck, P.H., p. 41.

Christianity when the Jews failed to heed the gospel. Avoiding modern philosophical distinctions, Munck clarifies the active relation which Paul saw between the purpose of God and certain events of the past, present, and future. Furthermore Munck ably defines the relation of these events to each other, not in an abstract theological framework, but within the perspective of the primitive church.¹ But because of the fixed suppositions which Munck brings to the text, the relation of Paul to these events and to his apostolic colleagues is continually distorted. This is particularly evident in the interpretation of two decisive passages, Ro. 10.14-21 and Ro. 11.11-16, 25, 26.

In Ro. 10.14,15, Paul describes what must occur before a man, whether Jew or Greek, can call on the name of the Lord and be saved, vss. 12,13. To call, one must first believe; to believe, one must hear; and for one to hear, a preacher is necessary, vs. 14. That Paul is referring to the apostolic mission is obvious from vs. 15, where he completes the chain of thought by stating that to preach, one must be commissioned, *ὡς δὲ κηρύξουσιν ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσιν*. He then adds an abbreviated quotation of Is. 52.7, *ὡς ἄρα τοὶ οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων ἀγαθὰ*, in which to change to the plural from the LXX, *εὐαγγελιζομένου* forms an unmistakable allusion to the apostles.² Although the church's messengers have thus fulfilled everything required for one to call upon the name of the Lord, vss. 14,15, Paul adds that not

1 J. Munck, *C.I.*, vide. esp. pp. 19-22, 31, 32, 36, 37, 46-51, 55-57, 60-62, 66, 70, 71, 85, 86, 88, 89, 96-98, 101-106.

2 Thus J. Munck, *C.I.*, p. 71.

all have heeded the gospel, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, vs. 16. The apostles like the prophet of old must say, "Lord, who has believed what he has heard from us?", vs. 16.

Since these vs. 16 statements refer to the unbelief of Israel, Munck believes that Paul is no longer speaking of the apostolate in general but the apostles who were sent to the Jews. However there is absolutely no evidence in the text of such a transition between vss. 15 and 16. Munck's view can only be sustained if one accepts his theory that certain apostles under Peter were restricted to the Jews and failed to gain a response, while Paul's Gentile work achieved an impressive success.¹ But we have seen that this view of a divided mission stems from a misinterpretation of Gal. 2.7-9, and cannot stand.²

From the O.T. quotations in Ro. 10.16-21 it is obvious that Paul is describing two reactions to the gospel, the "yes" of the Gentiles, and the "no" of the Jews; it is just as obvious that both reactions are occasioned by the one apostolic mission. The οὐ πάντες of vs. 16 corresponds to the οὐκ of vs. 13 and demonstrates that Paul is speaking of Israel's negative response to the gospel of the apostles, who are the basic link in the chain enabling both Jews and Greeks to call upon the name of the Lord.³ Furthermore Paul's adaption of Ps. 19.5 in vs. 18, "Their voice

1 J. Munck, C.I., pp. 72-76.

2 Cf. above pp. 156-164, 181-190.

3 B. Weiss, Die Paulinischen Briefe, p. 97; W. Sanday, A.C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans, I.C.C., pp. 296, 297; C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, pp. 169, 170.

has gone out to all the earth, and their words to the ends of the world," readily depicts the vast spread of the apostolic mission, but is an inept description of a ministry confined to Jews of the eastern diaspora. Thus in vss. 14-21 Paul is describing the impact of one witness on two peoples.¹

As an apostle with a share in this witness, Paul is personally involved in Israel's rejection of the gospel. He is not accounting for the failure of the other apostles to win converts from their Jewish mission. Rather Israel's refusal to heed the message of the apostles means that they have rejected Paul's preaching as well as Peter's and the others'.² This letter begins with Paul's affirmation of the Jews' prior claim to hear the gospel, 1.16. The apostle's practical application of this principle in the course of his mission and the consequent repudiation of his message by the Jews is well attested both by the Epistles and the book of Acts.³ It is also confirmed by the opening words of this section, 9.1-5, where we

1 P. Feine, Der Römerbrief, p. 121 has accurately expressed Paul's perspective: "The voice of the messengers has spread throughout the earth and their words to the ends of the world. But it has elicited the historical facts: the Gentiles have received the gospel, but Israel has remained unbelieving." Thus also H. Lietzmann, An die Römer, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, p. 97; A. Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit, pp. 316-319.

2 M. Lagrange, Épître aux Romains, Études Bibliques, p. 261, observes that vs. 16 reflects Paul's own experience with the Jews. Cf. also W. Michaelis, Das Neue Testament, II, 156 who connects the description of the extension of the apostolic ministry, vs. 18, with Paul's report of the coverage of his mission, Ro. 15.19,23, thus recognising that Paul includes his work within the one witness of the church which Israel has refused.

3 Gal. 5.11; I Th. 2.14-16; II Cor. 11.24-26; Acts 13.45-50; 14.2,19; 17.2-9,13; 18.6,12,19; 19.8,9; 20.3; Cf. above, p. 162.

have the most intense expression of feeling to be found in all of Paul's writing. The desire to be ἀνδοῦσα and cut off from Christ for the sake of Israel suggests that the Jews' rejection of the apostolic mission has been a personal rejection of Paul and his gospel.¹

In Ro. 11.11,12 Paul perceives a divine purpose in Israel's resistance to the Christian faith. Through their trespass salvation has come to the Gentiles. However the unbelief of the Jews is not permanent for their jealousy is aroused as God's blessing is poured out upon others and this jealousy shall lead

1 Cf. J.S. Stewart, op. cit., pp. 25, 26, 35; W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 179; M. Goguel, The Birth of Christianity, pp. 317f. J. Munck, C.I., pp. 26-30 opposes the view of Lietzmann that Ro. 9.3 is a rabbinic expression of selfless love. Instead he cites references from the Rabbinic literature (H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, op. cit., II, 280f.) where Jonah, Moses, David, Ezekiel, and Job express a desire to suffer in behalf of Israel. He concludes that Paul in Ro. 9.1-5 speaks as a New Testament heilsgeschichtliche figure. However H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, op. cit., III, 261 shows that Judaism made no such distinction in this regard. "They readily alluded to the great names of the former time, like Moses, David, and the prophets, but also to recognised men of the recent past, like Rabbi (Jehuda I) and Rabbi Eleazar ben Schimeon, who had suffered representatively for the whole people and so had come to be an atonement for Israel." Parentheses mine. Cf. also Rabbi Ismael's desire to become an atonement for the children of Israel, Negaim 2. 5-7 (The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I. Epstein, p. 238) which Epstein defines as "an expression of love and homage". Despite Munck's objections to these examples (they are conventional remarks: they usually apply to individual sins), the connection to Ro. 9.3 made by Strack and Billerbeck seems a valid one. Thus also C.K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans, B.N.T.C., p. 176. Therefore Ro. 9.3, in the light of Paul's personal repudiation by the Jews, is more intelligible as a spontaneous expression of love than as the declaration of a self-conscious heilsgeschichtliche figure.

to "their full inclusion", τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν, vs. 12. Accordingly Paul glorifies his apostolate to the Gentiles, in order to provoke jealousy from his fellow Jews and thus save some of them, ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν οὖν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἔθνῶν ἀπόστολος, τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω, εἴ πως παραζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ σώσω τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν, vs. 13, 14.

Focussing upon the words εἰμι ἐγὼ ἔθνῶν ἀπόστολος, vs. 13, Munck claims that they permit the interpretation "that Paul occupies an exceptional position and that the preaching to the Gentiles is entrusted specifically to him".¹ Paul's mission achieves the salvation of the Gentiles, which in turn elicits the jealousy of Israel and occasions their πλήρωμα. Therefore the jealousy created by Paul's work is regarded as the beginning stages of that which occurs upon the completion of his Gentile ministry. No distinction is made between the present stream of Jewish converts and their final salvation, nor "between that which Paul himself can accomplish and that which God will complete after this."² Thus the τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν, vs. 14, though indefinite, designates a large number of converted Jews.³

Munck has rightly observed and emphasized the significance which Paul attributes to jealousy in this sequence of redemptive events.⁴ His great contribution is the recognition that Paul locates his ministry within an eschatological drama. His mistake is assigning to Paul the only significant role in this

1 J. Munck, C.I., pp. 63f. 78f. 89f.; P.H., pp. 37f.

2 J. Munck, C.I., p. 93.

3 J. Munck, C.I., pp. 88-94; P.H., pp. 37-39.

4 J. Munck, C.I., pp. 63f., 78f., 89f., P.H., pp. 37-39.

drama. For in the phrase εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, the word ἀπόστολος is anarthrous and hardly supports the view that Paul is claiming to be the one pre-eminent apostle to the Gentiles. In fact, although Munck and countless other scholars continually particularize Paul as "the apostle of the Gentiles", Paul, in the eighteen times that he applies ἀπόστολος to himself, never once uses this expression.¹

The full construction ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν οὖν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω, vs. 13, provides an excellent illustration of the vocational consciousness that we have found throughout the Epistles. Paul is an apostle, (anarthrous), a member of the group entrusted with the ministry to Jews and Gentiles which precedes the End. Within this ministry he performs a particular service, τὴν διακονίαν (articulated), a pioneer mission to the Gentiles, ἐθνῶν.² Because Paul's work does not constitute the whole Gentile mission, the jealousy which he is provoking cannot be strictly identified with that jealousy that produces the final salvation of Israel. The fact remains that the πυνδὸς converted in Paul's present ministry, vs. 14, stand in contrast to the πλήρωμα of God's future action, vss. 11, 26, however much Munck may emphasize the possibility of an indefinite number being a large number. The Jews who out of jealousy are

¹ Gal. 1.1; I Th. 2.6; I Cor. 1.1; 4.9; 9.1,2; 15.9 (twice); II Cor. 1.1; Ro. 1.1; 11.13; Eph. 1.1; Col. 1.1; (I Ti. 1.1; 2.7; II Ti. 1.1,11; Tit. 1.1).

² Cf. above, p. 117. J. Munck, C.I., p. 91; P.H., p. 38, citing Zahn as an advocate of this view admits that it is a possible interpretation of the text, but then proceeds to defend his theory of Paul's exclusive apostolate.

won to Christ by Paul are therefore regarded as an anticipation, a prefiguring, or even a contribution to the coming salvation, but God's final incorporation of Israel still transcends the achievement and potential of Paul's personal work.¹

This same emphasis is evident once more in 11.25,26 when Paul refers to "The Fullness of the Gentiles". Summarizing the sequence of events in God's program of salvation, the Apostle speaks of the mystery whereby "a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles come in, and so all Israel will be saved," ὅτι πᾶραις ἀπὸ μέρους τῇ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ, καὶ οὕτως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται. The concept of a divinely determined number which must be realised before the coming of the End is evident in the speculations of Apocalyptic Judaism. In II Baruch 23.5 the final resurrection of the dead cannot occur until the number of those born is fulfilled.² According to IV Ezra 4.33-43, it is a number of righteous souls that must be realised before the final events can transpire.³ II Esdras 2.40,41 is cited by Munck in this connection, "Recipe, Sion, numerum tuum, et con-clude candidatos tuos, qui legem Domini compleverunt. Filiorum tuorum, quos optabas, plenus est numerus. Roga imperium Domini, ut sanctificetur populus tuus, qui vocatus est ab initio."⁴

1 Cf. A. Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit, p. 323; C.K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans, pp. 214f.

2 (A.P., II, 495); Cf. also II Baruch 21.10 (A.P., II, 494). In Abodah Zarah 5a (The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I Epstein, p. 20), the Messiah will not appear until all the souls destined to inhabit earthly bodies have come; Cf. also Yabamoth 62a (Ibid., ed. I. Epstein, p. 415.)

3 (A.P., II, 566-568); Cf. also II Baruch 30.2 (A.P., II, 498).

4 J. Munck, C.I., pp. 99f.

The same idea appears in the canonical Rv. 6.11 where the Christian martyrs will not be avenged until their number is complete, ἕως πληρωθῶσιν καὶ οἱ σὺνδουλοι αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν οἱ μέλλοντες ἀποκτείνεσθαι ὡς καὶ αὐτοί. ¹

Munck denies the relationship between II Baruch 23.5 II Esdras 2.40, 41 and the πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνων of Ro. 11.25. He argues that the number (numerus) referred to by the Jewish apocalypses would be ἀριθμός and not πλήρωμα in the Greek. Since only fragments of the Greek version of II Baruch remain and the assumed Greek original of IV Ezra is lost, this must remain an argument from silence.² Nevertheless, although Munck is correct in translating numerus by ἀριθμός, the expression "full number" (plenus est numerus) can readily be rendered πλήρωμα. For example Herodotus uses πλήρωμα to designate the full number of ships in a fleet,³ Aristotle speaks of the full number of citizens, πλήρωμα πόλεως,⁴ and Moulton and Milligan cite examples from the papyri where πλήρωμα refers to a complete work gang and the entire crew of a ship.⁵

1 Contra. J. Munck, C.I., p. 100, who in this text suggests that πληρῶν be translated "fully paid or rewarded". However the ἕως indicates that the action denoted by πληρῶν must occur before the granting of the reward, which in this case seems identical with the vengeance taken by God upon the persecutors of his servants.

2 G.H. Box, "IV Ezra, General Introduction," A.P., II, 542-547; R.H. Charles, "II Baruch, Introduction," A.P., II, 470.

3 Herodotus, History, VIII 43, 45 (Loeb, IV, 40, 42).

4 Aristotle, Politics, II 4.13; III 8.1; IV 3.12 (Loeb, pp. 118, 240, 294).

5 J.H. Moulton, G. Milligan, op. cit., p. 520. Moulton and Milligan apply these examples to Ro. 11.25. Cf. also H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, op. cit., II, 1420 who give several examples under the heading "full number", or "total".

Secondly Munck appeals to instances of the verb πληρῶ (πληροφορέω), Ro. 15.19; Col. 1.25; II Tim. 4.17 in which "we see πληρῶ applied in three contexts to the full spread of the gospel among the heathen, and accordingly τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν can have a corresponding special meaning. 'The Fullness of the Gentiles' designates then the achievement of the goal towards which Paul strives in his preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles...."¹ We have observed however, that although the completion of Paul's pioneer mission in the eastern Mediterranean, Ro. 15.19, and his witness before Caesar, II Tim. 4.17, are significant accomplishments of his ministry, they cannot represent "The Fullness of the Gentiles".² Similarly the εἰς ὑμᾶς in Col. 1.25 demonstrates that Paul is describing a specific commission to fulfill the word in Colossae, κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.³ Both grammatically and logically a much closer parallel to Ro. 11.25, ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ, is the use of πλήρωμα in Gal. 4.4, ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. Delling connects these two verses with the statement, "Clearly πλήρωμα has been used passively of time in expressions which concern the divine plan of salvation."⁴

1 J. Munck, C.I., p. 100.

2 Cf. above, pp. 200-207, 216-223.

3 Cf. E. Lohmeyer, Die Briefe an die Philipper, and die Kolosser und an Philemon, pp. 80f.

4 D.G. Delling, "πλήρης," T.W.N.T., VI, 303; Cf. also H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater, pp. 137f.

Finally Munck considers the concept of the "full number" irrelevant because it involves a divine predestination that is foreign to the thought of Ro. 9 - 11. It is true that the apocalyptists remained relatively passive in their conviction that God had unalterably "weighed the age", "measured the times", and "numbered the seasons",¹ and they only involved themselves by reckoning and speculating over the probable date of the End.² Paul, on the other hand, saw himself actively related to the purpose of God. His insight into the mystery of the final salvation was an incentive in his mission to the Gentiles, Ro. 11.13; Eph. 3.1-10; Col. 1.25,26.

Nevertheless the basic presupposition of the Jewish concept of the "full number", that God freely determines the course of events is the truth which undergirds Paul's thought in Ro. 9 - 11. The section begins with the assertion that God's salvation proceeds according to his sovereign will, 9.6-29, and ends with a hymn of praise to the "unsearchable judgements" and "incomprehensible ways" of the divine wisdom, 11.33-36. "The Fullness of the Gentiles" is itself an aspect of the *πληροtes*, 11.25, a word which Paul employs to depict the gradual unfolding of God's plan through the ages and its sudden manifestation in the time of fulfillment, Ro. 16.25-27; Eph. 1.9,10; 3.1-10;

1 IV Ezra 4.36,37 (A.P., II, 567); Cf. also II Baruch 21.8; 48.2,3 (A.P., II, 493, 504); Testament of Naphtali 2.3 (A.P., II, 336); Wisd. 11.20; Philo, *On Dreams*, II 193-194 (Loeb, V, 530); 1 Q.S. 3.15-17 (D.S.S.II.2); 1 Q.H., 1.23-25 (O.M.G.); C.D. 2.9-11 (Z.D., pp. 6-9).

2 Cf. above, p. 191, nt. 1; G.H. Box on IV Ezra 4.36,37, A.P., II 567; O. Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, pp. 156f., 166f. A significant exception is the Qumran Community which considered itself the vehicle for effecting God's plan in the last days. Cf. above, p. 198, nt. 1.

Col. 1.25,26.¹

Therefore Barrett's rendering of τὸ πλήρωμα in vs. 25 as "the number intended by God" corresponds to this predominant emphasis of Ro. 9 - 11.² It is doubtful that Paul regarded the number inviolably fixed before the foundation of the world, but it is certain that he considers "The Fullness of the Gentiles" as an object defined only in God's mind and realised only by God's action. Munck clashes with the context of Ro. 9 - 11 by interpreting τὸ πλήρωμα as the goal of Paul's mission whether this goal is (1) the gathering of a representative body of converts from every nation, (2) the assembling in Jerusalem of a large group of Gentiles bearing gifts and offerings, or (3) the witness before Caesar.

To be sure Paul related his mission at every point to God's plan of salvation for the Gentiles and for the Jews. But although he contributes, he does not achieve the πλήρωμα; he hastens, but he does not condition its fulfillment. Paul perceives the mystery of the final events, but views himself as one among the ἅγιοι, Col. 1.26, one of the ἀπόστολοι, Eph. 3.5, who are instruments that are used as God accomplishes the divine plan.

Since "The Fullness of the Gentiles" is of God's determination and transcends the limitations of Paul's work, the

1 Cf. above, pp. 41-44.

2 C.K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans, p. 223; Thus also W. Sanday, A.C. Headlam, op. cit., p. 335 who support the connection to the idea of the "full number" in the Jewish apocalyptic literature; A. Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit, p. 327; C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, p. 182.

return of Christ is not anticipated with his complete coverage of the nations, his delivery of the offering, or his testimony in Rome. Rather Paul shares the conviction of the early church that the end is prepared by God and that Christ's coming though preceded by obvious signs can occur at any time, I Th. 5.12 (II Th. 2.1-10); Mk. 13.32; Acts 1.6,7. The goal of his ministry is that his work as a pioneer missionary be acceptable to God on that day, I Th. 2.19,20.¹

XI

A Summary of Conclusions Reached in Part Three

We have treated the agreement reported in Gal. 2.7-9 as decisive for interpreting the perspective, strategy and goal of Paul's mission in relation to the task of the whole church. This agreement is not based upon two different gospels, one preached by Peter to the Jews, the other by Paul to the Gentiles. Although a radical Judaistic faction in Jerusalem opposes Paul's message, Peter, James, and John recognise that the gospel which Paul proclaims to the Gentiles conforms to the approved kerugma. Therefore Gal. 2.7-9 involves one gospel, but one gospel that is applied to two distinct situations. Christ is salvation for

1. Cf. also I Th. 3.14; I Cor. 3.13; II Cor. 1.14; Ro. 15.15, 16; Phil. 2.15,16; 4.1; II Tim. 4.6-8; above, pp. 52-69.

both Jew and Greek, but the Jew is advised to continue in the Law as an acceptable pattern for life while the Gentile is given freedom in Christ.

Furthermore the agreement of Gal. 2.7-9 does not entail a division of the mission so that Peter is committed exclusively to the Jews and Paul is charged with the Gentiles. The original apostles act according to the commission which they receive from Christ, and this commission gives them a responsibility for Gentiles as well as Jews. They don't locate the conversion of the Gentiles in the period following the parousia (Fridrichsen), nor do they require the salvation of Israel before undertaking a world mission (Munck). On the contrary, in spite of many factors which determine their apparent hesitation in turning to the Gentiles, they are represented in both the Acts and the Epistles as participating in every new extension of the church and welcoming every advance of the gospel beyond the frontiers of Judaism, including the success of Paul. The original apostles recognise that Paul has been divinely endowed for the ministry to the Gentiles just as they themselves have been gifted for the Jewish work. Therefore the agreement does not create two missions, but rather concerns the deploying of leadership within one mission according to the evident guidance of God.

Finally Gal. 2.7-9 does not involve a partition of the mission field. The fact that there is no mention of Egypt by Peter or Paul, and the lack of any reliable information associating them with the origin of Christianity in Alexandria, argue against the view that either apostle was assigned to this district.

Moreover the early tradition that connects Peter with churches in northwestern Asia Minor, Corinth, and Rome makes it improbable that his work was confined to a limited area of the eastern diaspora. We know that Paul did not plan his movements according to a territorial agreement but according to the commission which restricted him to a pioneer work. From all that we know of Peter's activity it is likely that he too was motivated by a specific commission from the risen Christ, a commission which directed him to act as an overseer in the extension of the faith throughout the world.

By interpreting Gal. 2.1-10 as a division of gospel, of mission, or of territory, the main fact which Paul intends to convey is overlooked. This is that fourteen (17) years after his conversion he was officially recognised as a full partner in the work of the church. The pillar apostles could not deny that God's power was evident in Paul's ministry and on this ground they were prepared to acknowledge his divine call. They see that Paul's witness to the Gentiles is fulfilling the responsibility for world mission which they themselves received from Christ. The result of this recognition is not the creation of two missionary organizations (Cullmann) nor the resolve to follow differing views of the sequence of eschatological events (Munck), but a pledge of *κοινωνία* which incorporates the work of Paul, Barnabas and the pillar apostles into one mission.

The perspective of the Gal. 2.7-9 agreement opposes Cullmann's interpretation of the Gentile mission as the "restraining thing" and Paul himself as the "restraining one", II Th. 2.6,7.

Although Paul unquestionably connects his work to God's plan of salvation in the time preceding the End, he does not perform the exclusive, deterministic function within this plan that Cullmann's view requires. The Gentile mission is not personified in Paul but is exercised through a partnership of the apostles. Moreover the decisive role of ὁ κατέχων in the eschatological drama does not correspond with Paul's own relation to the final events as presented in the Thessalonian Epistles. Rather than being a statement of Paul's apostolic consciousness, II Th. 2.1-12 is more intelligible as a terse Christian eschatology in a Jewish apocalyptic framework.

By defining the goal of Paul's mission as τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν, Munck too attributes an exclusive, deterministic function to the apostle. "The Fullness of the Gentiles" can not refer to a representative group of Gentile converts whom Paul gathers from every nation. Although he personally is restricted by his commission to the laying of an initial foundation in each community, he expects that the community itself will then become the missionary agent spreading its faith to the surrounding country. In this way he fulfills his debt to all men. His own work is limited but his vision is nevertheless comprehensive rather than representative.

It is even less probable that Paul regarded the appointed Gentiles with their offering as τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν. This view lacks exegetical support and conflicts with Paul's intention to begin a mission in the West following the delivery of the collection in Jerusalem. However it is obvious from the size of the delegation assigned to bear the funds and from Paul's own

desire to accompany them that the apostle envisions more than the relief of the poor. The offering is the seal of an agreement in which Paul and the pillar apostles unite in the one mission of the church, Gal. 2.10. It is a response of the Gentile communities to the faith which has come to them from Jerusalem. The *κοινωνία* of material goods symbolizes the greater spiritual fellowship, the common participation of Jew and Gentile in Christ, II Cor. 9.13; Ro. 15.26.

Finally Munck demonstrates that Paul considered his witness before Caesar a notable advance in the cause of the gospel, but his view that Paul saw this witness as "The Fullness of the Gentiles" is unconvincing. Even if one accepts Munck's approach to the controversial II Tim. 4.16,17, it is hardly possible that Paul would devote a single sentence to an achievement which was to occasion the conversion of Israel and the return of Christ. Furthermore no imminent expectation of these final events is evident in the context. In the same way Phil. 1.7-18 expresses Paul's belief that his imprisonment furthers the spread of the faith, but the passage also demonstrates that the apostle does not limit the Gentile mission to his personal ministry. Although his own activity is thwarted he can still rejoice as the witness of Christ is carried forth by others.

Munck's attempt to identify τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν with a representative gathering of Gentile converts, with the presentation of the offering in Jerusalem, and with the apostle's witness before Caesar is essentially based upon one interpretation, namely that Paul is an apostle in a pre-eminent, exclusive sense and that his Gentile mission has a determinative relation to

"The Fullness of the Gentiles," the conversion of Israel, and the return of Christ. This viewpoint can not be supported from Gal. 2.7-9 nor II Th. 2.6,7 and finally it is not to be found in Ro. 9 - 11.

In Ro. 10.14,15 it is the apostolic ministry and not the ministry of Paul that is the basic link in the chain enabling both Jews and Gentiles to call upon the name of the Lord and be saved. Throughout this section Paul is speaking of two responses which have been given to the gospel of the apostles, the assent of the Gentiles and the hardening of Israel. As a member of the apostolate, Paul, as well as Peter and the others, has experienced the rejection of Christ by the Jews. When Paul does refer to his own office, Ro. 11.13,14, he does not particularize himself in the way that Munck and others suggest. He is not the apostle of the Gentiles and his ministry does not achieve the πλήρωμα. Rather his specialized work is only a share in the salvation that God is effecting through his chosen servants.¹ This is evident in Paul's use of πλήρωμα, a term which stems from the Jewish Apocalyptic concept of the "full number" and expresses God's sovereign determination of the events of history and the lives of men.

Therefore "The Fullness of the Gentiles" does not denote a goal in Paul's mind but the realization of God's plan. All that Paul is doing contributes to this realization but the divine work transcends the accomplishments of his mission and incorporates the work of all those who proclaim Christ to the Gentiles. Paul's goal is that his specialized mission, his particular contribution to "The Fullness of the Gentiles", might be acceptable to God whenever Christ appears.

1. See Supplementary Sheet, note 2.

Extended Notes

1. W. Foerster, "Die δοκοῦντες in Gal. 2," Z.N.W., XXXVI (1937), p. 286; H. Lietzmann, Galaterbrief, p. 233; E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 71, 72 are correct in referring οἱ δοκοῦντες, vss. 2, 6, 9 to Peter, John, and James, the Lord's brother. Vss. 2 and 9 demonstrate that Paul does not object to the esteem with which these apostles are regarded, but it is evident from vs. 6, ὅποιοι ποτε ἦσαν οὐδέν μοι διαφέρει πρόσωπον ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει, that he does not consider their former standing with Jesus a legitimate basis for this esteem.

C.K. Barrett, "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles," Studia Paulina, pp. 1-19 has an enlightening interpretation of δοκεῖν in Gal. 2.1-10 particularly of its use with σῦλος in vs. 9, οἱ δοκοῦντες σῦλοι εἶναι. Barrett connects σῦλος to the οἶκος terminology (Cf. above, pp. 40, 41) and to the concept of the new Temple of God, closely related metaphors which depict the church as the fulfillment of God's plan of salvation and the gathering of God's people in the last days. As divinely, chosen instruments for the New Age, Peter, John and James are recognised in Jerusalem and also by Paul as the "'pillars' of the eschatological temple." However σῦλος soon degenerates in usage at Jerusalem. It is disconnected from this eschatological perspective and comes to designate merely a static institutional authority. This explains Paul's use of δοκεῖν. Though he accepts Peter, John, and James as σῦλοι within God's plan of salvation for the last days, he objects to the significance which is attributed to the σῦλοι by the Jerusalem church. Paul's situation, according to Barrett's interpretation, is therefore closely related to his position with regard to the ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι in II Cor. 11.5. Cf. above, pp. 96-99; also H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, op. cit., III, 537.

2. H.J. Schoeps, Paulus, pp. 62, 63. In contrast to Baur's interpretation of primitive Christianity as the struggle of two rival parties, the complex composition of the early church has been increasingly considered. Vide. the diagram of F.W. Farrar, The Life and Work of St. Paul, p. 92 which represents Peter as a liberal influence between the strict Hebraists on one side and the Hellenists, Paul and the Gentile converts on the other. This approach is recognised as a basic departure from Baur and followed with minor deviations by F.C. Burkitt, op. cit., pp. 104-106, F.J. Foakes Jackson, K. Lake, "The Disciples in Jerusalem," The Beginnings of Christianity, I, 309-313. Cf. also J. Wagenmann, op. cit., pp. 26f., M. Dibelius, W.G. Kummel, Paul, p. 128; W. Grundmann, "Die Apostel zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia," Z.N.W., XXXIX (1940), 110, 121, 122. However attempts to reassert Baur's delineation of the conflict have not been lacking, E. Meyer, op. cit., III, 432-438; S.G.F. Brandon, op. cit., pp. 126-153.

Scholars besides Schoeps who have seen James as well as

Peter in a mediating position include G. Sass, op. cit., pp. 123, 124, E. Hirsch, "Petrus und Paulus", Z.N.W. XXIX (1930), 69, 70; G. Kittel, "Die Stellung des Jakobus zu Judentum und Heidenchristentum," Z.N.W., XXX (1931), 145ff. J. Munck, P.H., 105-111 finds a consistent picture of James in the Epistles of Paul, Acts, the Epistle of James and the account of the death of James in Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae, XX, 9.1 (Dindorfius, I, 786). Throughout James is clearly separated from orthodox Judaism, and though his mission is to the Jews, he nevertheless recognises the gospel and apostolate of Paul. The traditional interpretation of James as the pious leader of the Judaisers demanding circumcision and Law observance from all Christian converts arises according to Munck from an uncritical acceptance of Hegesippus' version of the martyrdom of James in Eusebius, Historiae Ecclesiasticae, II, 23.4-18 (P.G. XX, 200-205). At this point we can accept Munck's contribution to the evidence that both Peter and James shared Paul's viewpoint concerning the priority of grace and the uniqueness of Christian faith. But we must also recognise that by eliminating Paul's conflict with the Jerusalem church altogether, Munck has dismissed the valid as well as the objectionable aspect of Baur's position. Baur was not mistaken in locating opposition to Paul at Jerusalem but only in ranging Peter and James on the side of this opposition. (1) Munck on the other hand, traces the demand of the ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι for the circumcision of Titus, Gal. 2.4,5, to Judaizing Gentile Christians in Galatia, claiming that Paul has inserted the incident into his account of the Jerusalem conference, P.H., p. 89. (2) He suggests that the τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, Gal. 2.12, are on no official church business but are merely Jerusalem Christians travelling through Antioch. The phrase φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς is Paul's inept way of describing Peter's concern that participation with Gentiles at the common table may jeopardize the success of his Jewish mission, P.H., pp. 94,99. (3) The ψευδοαποστόλοι of II Cor. 11.12-15 are neither Judaisers nor Palestinians but Jewish Christian missionaries sent by Christ or by other communities, P.H., p. 179. (4) According to Munck, the οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς of Acts 11.3 does not refer to a Judaizing party but is merely a designation for Jewish Christians and the question over the food laws which they put to Peter is introduced into the narrative by Luke, P.H., pp. 224-226. (5) Similarly the Judaisers demanding circumcision and Law observance have been transferred by Luke from the Gentile communities to Jerusalem, in the case of both the delegates to Antioch, Acts 15.1, P.H., p. 226, (6) and the converted Pharisees who represent the strict Judaistic viewpoint at the conference, Acts 15.5, P.H., 239-241. (7) Finally by striking τῶν πεπιστευκότων from the phrase ποῦτι μὴ ἀδελφοὶ εἰσὶν ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τῶν πεπιστευκότων, Acts 21.20, Munck asserts that the agitation against Paul during his final visit in Jerusalem does not come from Jewish Christians but from unbelieving Jews, P.H., p. 235.

Thus through a variety of questionable methods and interpretations, Munck has attempted to resolve Paul's conflict with the whole of the Jerusalem church. But although we welcome Munck's efforts to clear the air between Paul and Peter and James, it is nevertheless apparent that the facts in each of the seven instances above can be best explained by assuming the existence

of a sizable, organised, vociferous Judaizing minority in the Jerusalem church which contends for circumcision and Law observance as requirements for the entrance of Gentiles into the Christian fellowship.

3. E. Hirsch, op. cit., p. 65. To this weakness W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 183, adds a second, namely that the transactions of Gal. 2.1-10 were concluded privately with the Jerusalem leaders, and therefore Paul still lacked the approval of the primitive community as a whole. Out of these two difficulties arises considerable misunderstanding and controversy between Paul and the Jerusalem church, which is intensified by Peter's action at Antioch and the success of Paul's First Missionary Journey. The Apostolic Council, Acts 15.4-29 represents an attempt to resolve the problems which issue from the Gal. 2.1-10 agreement.

This view of the historical development depends of course upon the identification of Gal. 2.1-10 with the so-called Famine Visit of Acts 11.27 - 12.25. Two principal arguments are usually given for this identification and against the connection to Acts 15.4-29; (1) There is a correspondence between the two trips to Jerusalem in the Epistle to the Galatians and the first two visits recorded in Acts, so that Paul is not placed in the difficult position of having omitted the Famine Visit from a statement which he delivers under oath, Gal. 1.20. (2) By dating the Epistle prior to the council of Acts 15.4-29, one explains Paul's failure to cite the decisions reached at this council (particularly the Apostolic Decree) when such a citation would have foiled the argument of his opposition in Galatia and immediately clarified the misunderstanding at Antioch, Gal. 2.11ff. Rather Paul says that nothing was added to his gospel but the one stipulation that he should continue his collection for the Jerusalem poor, Gal. 2.6-10. For this view Cf. also W.M. Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, pp. 54-59; F.C. Burkitt, op. cit., pp. 57, 117; G.S. Duncan, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, pp. XXII-XXXI which includes a reconstruction of events similar to that of Knox; C.S.C. Williams, op. cit., pp. 24-35 which is of special value for questions of chronology; R. Bultmann, "Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte," New Testament Essays, pp. 72, 73, 79. The most comprehensive presentation of issues pertinent to this discussion is in K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, pp. 275-304.

We must recognize that both arguments presented above can be met by those who accept the identification of Gal. 2.1-10 with Acts 15.4-29. However since the classic presentation of this latter position by J.B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 125-128, the qualifications made by many who have adopted his basic viewpoint reveal the continuing force of the two arguments. J. Knox, op. cit., pp. 67-70, for example, connects Acts 15 with Gal. 2.1-10 but dismisses the Famine Visit as historically impossible. Others such as M. Dibelius, "The Apostolic Council", Studies in the Acts of the Apostles trans. M. Ling, pp. 93-101; O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, pp. 47-50 accept Lightfoot's identification but assign a later date for the drafting of the

Apostolic decree. E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians, pp. 115-117, both eliminates the Famine visit and postdates the Decree while maintaining the correlation of Acts 15 and Gal. 2.

A third solution to this problem has been to take both Acts 11.27 - 12.25 and Acts 15.4-29 as sources which correspond to Gal. 2.1-10. Advocates of this view include K. Lake, "The Apostolic Council of Jerusalem," The Beginnings of Christianity, V, 199-212, who departs from his earlier identification of Gal. 2.1-10 and Acts 11.27 - 12.25; A.D. Nock, op. cit., pp. 115-116; J. Jeremias, "Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte," Z.N.W., pp. 217, 218; H.J. Schoeps, op. cit., pp. 59-64. This view frees Paul from the charge of having omitted the Famine Visit, thus satisfying the first argument above, but it fails to explain his disregard of the Decree. Accordingly Lake, Nock, and Jeremias date the Decree after the Jerusalem Conference, and Schoeps argues that these provisions only applied to the field of the Jewish Christian mission.

Though it is obvious that an easy solution to this problem is a naive one, we accept the identification of Gal. 2.1-10 with Acts 11.27- 12.25 as the most likely explanation for the factors involved. Taking as fixed points the death of Herod Agrippa in A.D. 44, Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae, XIX, 8.2 (Dindorfius, I, 765) and the proconsulate of Gallio in A.D. 52 (Vide the Delphi Inscription, A. Deissmann, Paul, pp. 272, 273.), the situation can be reconstructed as follows:

(1) The Famine Visit, Acts 11.27 - 12.25, Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae XX 2.5 (Dindorfius, I, 772, 773) and the Jerusalem Conference, Gal. 2.1-10, A.D. 46 where the leaders affirm the validity of Paul's gospel which gives Gentiles free access to the Christian fellowship. (2) The Antioch Incident, Gal. 2.11ff, A.D. 47 where the failure of the Conference to clarify the problem of the mixed community is exposed. (3) The First Missionary Journey, Acts 13.1 - 14.28; Gal. 1.2, A.D. 48, which aggravates the problem by adding considerably to the number of Gentile Christians and the number of communities with mixed membership. (4) The Apostolic Council, Acts 15.4-29, A.D. 49 where the Jerusalem leaders publicly confirm their previous private acceptance of Paul's gospel and attempt to resolve the difficulty of the mixed community by drafting the Decree. This view presupposes that the Epistle to the Galatians is addressed to churches in the Roman province of Galatia and that it is the earliest of Paul's letters, written after (3) the First Missionary Journey immediately before (4) the Apostolic Council.

4. The force of this argument remains despite the opinion of J. Jeremias, Jesus Promise to the Nations, pp. 22, 23 that 13.10 is an isolated logion of Jesus that Mark has mistakenly interpolated into this context. O. Cullmann, C.E., p. 218 correctly observes that, even if one concedes this point, it does not alter the fact that the primitive Christian community regarded the preaching of the gospel to the world as one of the events preceding the End. Cf. also V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 507, who

supports Jeremias in his view that Mark has interpolated 13.10 but nevertheless describes the verse as "a comment expressing what Mark believed to be the mind of Jesus." It is also pertinent that the parallel verse, Mt. 24.14, which J. Jeremias, loc. cit., accepts as an earlier form of the logion has essentially the same context.

An even more subtle attempt to disconnect Mk. 13.10; 14.9 from the perspective of a worldwide mission has come from G.D. Kilpatrick, "The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mark 13.9-11," Studies in the Gospels, ed. D.E. Nineham, pp. 145-158 who develops an earlier construction of F.C. Burkitt, op. cit., pp. 145-147. Kilpatrick appends vs. 10a καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη to vs. 9 and prefixes 10b πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον to vs. 11. As in the case of Jeremias, however, it is possible to concede Kilpatrick his point and still preserve the concept of a Gentile mission, for his interpretation does not ultimately depend on this division but upon his translation once the division is made and also upon additional suppositions which he presents. These latter include the belief (1) that the primitive community envisioned a mission restricted to the Jews of Palestine and the diaspora, (2) that preaching to Gentiles was a hotly contested issue in the early church, (3) and that a universal standpoint is altogether lacking from Mark's gospel (e.g. at Mk. 11.17; 14.9; 15.39). In the course of our discussion we shall seek to demonstrate that all three of these views are mistaken. Cf. G.R.B. Murray, A Commentary on Mark Thirteen, pp. 42-45. M. Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, p. 61 makes an unconvincing attempt to eliminate Mk. 14.9 on the basis of Form Criticism. Treating 14.3-9 as a simple narrative (Paradigm) of the type used in early Christian propagandizing, he deletes vs. 9, since "words offering praise to a secondary person are completely foreign to Paradigms."

5. In regard to the first question, the report of the Vatican Excavations has produced considerable circumstantial evidence to support the contention that the builders of the pre-Constantinian shrine thought they had located the actual grave of Peter. Vide the detailed account of the excavations and the diagrams, J.M.C. Toynbee, J.W. Perkins, op. cit., pp. 135-162.

The answer to the second question which has gained the most adherents is that of H. Lietzmann, Petrus und Paulus in Rom, pp. 109-126. Principally from the Roman calendar of religious festival days prepared from earlier documents by Philocalus, 354 A.D., Lietzmann conjectures that the bodies of Peter and Paul were transferred to the catacombs beneath St. Sabastians on June 29, 258 A.D. and remained there until the Basilicas of Constantine were completed on the sites of Gaius' τρεῖς. This provides a reasonable explanation for the calendars, the inscription of Damascus, the graffiti in the St. Sabastian catacombs, and numerous legends. However there is no actual evidence that a body was removed from the Vatican hill site (assuming for the argument that the excavation has accurately located the grave believed in the third century to be Peter's), interred for approximately fifty years beneath

St. Sabastians, and reburied in the original Vatican tomb. Several other considerations also oppose Lietzmann's interpretation, e.g. the official Roman protection of graves. Accordingly Cullmann has taken the view that the memorial shrine in the St. Sabastian catacombs was the scene of cultic veneration of Peter and Paul without their actual physical remains ever being located there. O. Cullmann, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, pp. 123-132; H. Chadwick, op. cit., pp. 47-52 conjectures that the cultic ritual was initiated by a vision at the site of the memorial shrine.

6. We have little precise information concerning the first fourteen (17) years of Paul's ministry. His call to the Gentiles coincides with his conversion and probably is first fulfilled with his mission to the Nabatean Kingdom of Arabia, Gal. 1.17. This follows logically (1) from the implication of Gal. 1.15-17 where Paul expresses the purpose of the revelation, ἵνα εὐαγγελίσωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, vs. 16, and then states his immediate (εὐθέως) response, ἀλλὰ ἀπηλθὼν εἰς Ἀραβίαν, vs. 17; (2) from II Cor. 11.32,33 (Acts 9.23-25) where it is evident that the reception of Paul's preaching by the Nabateans was extensive enough to arouse opposition that was officially organized; and finally (3) from the general rule manifesting itself more than once in our discussion (Cf. above, pp. 21,22,52-64) viz. that Paul's thought is not created in quiet reflective detachment but in the maelstrom of daily action and experience. K. Lake, "The Conversion of Paul," The Beginnings of Christianity, V, 192-195; G. Sass, op. cit., p. 117.

This raises the question of the account of Paul's conversion in Acts 22.3-21 where his call to the Gentiles seemingly occurs with the vision in the Temple, vss. 17-21, on the occasion of his first visit to Jerusalem, Gal. 1.18,19 (Acts 9.26-30). Accordingly H.S. Nash, "Paul the Apostle," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, ed. S.M. Jackson, VIII, 401, claims that Paul for three years was an apostle to the Jews and only turned to the Gentiles following this experience. P. Gaechter, op. cit., pp. 411-415 regards the Temple vision as one in a series of events anticipating Paul's later decision to abandon his ministry to the Jews and concentrate upon the Gentiles. Against these views, M. Dibelius, W.G. Kümmel, Paul, p. 67; J. Wagenmann, op. cit., pp. 33,34,43 rightly insist that Paul from his conversion is conscious of his divine appointment to the Gentile mission, but they therefore minimize the significance of the Jerusalem vision. However, when we examine the actual commands that are issued to Paul at this time, σπεῦσον καὶ ἔξελθε ἐν τάχει ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, διότι οὐ παραδέχονται σοὺ μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ, vs. 18; πορεύου, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰς ἔθνη μακρὰν ἐξαποστελῶ σε, vs. 21, and compare them with the call to the Gentiles received at his conversion, Gal. 1.16; Acts 9.15; 22.15; 26.17,18 (On the place of Ananias in these accounts, cf. H.H. Wendt, op. cit., pp. 218,219), a marked difference of emphasis is evident. The new element in the Temple experience is that Paul is to fulfill his commission at a distance, by travelling directly to the Gentiles. Note the pres. imper. πορεύου, the

adv. μακρῶν, "far away", "at a distance", and particularly the threefold occurrence of ἐκ (ἐξελθε, ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ἐξαποστείλω) accenting the idea, "away". If the Damascus revelation answers the question "what" by informing Paul that he is to be a witness to the Gentiles, the Temple vision answers the question "how" by prescribing that his commission is to be fulfilled through an itinerant mission. Cf. W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, pp. 103-105, 123-125; R. Liechtenhan, op. cit., pp. 49-51 (who offers the plausible suggestion that the Twelve like Paul received a general commission to the world but also like him required further specific instruction before undertaking the actual task). His preaching journeys through Syria and Cilicia, Gal. 1.21, can be interpreted as his immediate response to the vision. Concerning this phase of the mission no definite knowledge is obtainable but at least two inferences can be drawn: From the invitation to join the ministry in Antioch, which Barnabas extends to Paul, Acts 11.25, we may assume that Paul's activity was concentrated upon the Gentiles, and from the numerous sufferings of II Cor. 11.23-29 which cannot be harmonized with the accounts of Paul's journeys in Acts, we can surmise that it was a period of intense persecution.

This dearth of available information does not prevent us, however, from citing one obvious trend of this first fourteen years: Paul's work draws him into an ever closer relationship with the pillar apostles. His first contact does not come until three years after his conversion when he devotes two weeks of a stay in Jerusalem for making the acquaintance of Peter, Gal. 1.18,19. Sometime following this he is persuaded to resign his independent work and join forces with Barnabas who is the delegate of the primitive church, Acts 11.22-26. By the end of this period Paul is convinced that his message to be valid must correspond to the apostles' gospel and he journeys to Jerusalem in the firm conviction that God has directed him to confer with the leaders of the Jewish Christian mission, Gal. 2.1,2.

7. The wording of Ro. 15.19, ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωμέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, certainly favors the view that Paul is expressing a comprehensive rather than representative coverage of the designated area. On the basis of three exegetical considerations, the following translation seems most probable, "so that all over the area from Jerusalem to Illyricum I have fully completed the gospel of Christ." (1) πληρῶν is employed in the Epistles in the sense of a literal filling, fulfillment or completion. In the context of Ro. 15.19, F.W. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, op. cit., p. 677 accurately express the sense with the phrase "bring the gospel to completion by proclaiming it in the most remote areas." (2) The dative κύκλῳ means in a circle but used as an adverb is generally rendered, "around," "all around", or "all over." This comprehensive sense is evident in the examples cited by J.H. Moulton, G. Milligan, op. cit., p. 363 and H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, op. cit., I, 1007. Cf. P. Lond. 891.9, ἡ ἐβφημία σου

περικύκλωσεν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 458. (3) The precise geographical terms, ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ and μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ demonstrate that Paul is reporting the precise geographical coverage of the gospel. Were he concerned with a representative response in every nation we would expect a more general description such as ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίᾳ, μέχρι τῆς Μακεδονίας, or μέχρι τῆς Ἀχαΐας.

ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ does not necessarily signify that Paul preached in Judaea as J. Munck, *P.H.*, p. 44 suggests. Despite the testimony of Acts 9.28, 29; 26.20, such a mission is difficult to reconcile with Paul's account of his first fourteen (17) years in the ministry, Gal. 1.11 - 2.10, particularly with the statement of Gal. 1.22, ἤμην δὲ ἄγνωστος τοῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Ἰουδαίας ταῖς ἐν Χριστῷ. A more likely solution is that Paul considers the work of the original apostles in Palestine within the framework of his own task, just as he reckoned the mission of his communities to be the fulfillment of his personal responsibility. Thus E. Lohmeyer, *Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie*, p. 172; G. Sass, *op. cit.*, p. 129. If this interpretation is valid, we have here an expression of the κοινωνία in which Paul, Barnabas, and the pillars agreed to conduct the apostolic mission, Gal. 2.7-9. As Peter, James and John fulfill their debt to Asia Minor and Greece through Paul's work, so Paul in partnership with the pillars can claim to have completed the gospel ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ.

8. Nevertheless Holl's article "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde," is of immense value in defining Paul's relationship with the original apostles and particularly with the primitive church in Jerusalem. This aspect of Paul's thought has often been ignored in comparisons between the Acts and Epistles. For instance B.S. Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 19, sees the "Jerusalem frame to all of Paul's ministry" as a characteristic peculiar to Acts. More recently J. Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, pp. 26, 27, 40, 41 has repudiated the concept of a missionary journey for understanding Paul's activity. Paul's beginning and ending each step of his mission in Jerusalem (or Antioch) is, according to Knox a representation of Luke-Acts. A similar view is expressed by D.W. Riddle, *op. cit.*, pp. 106, 107; 191-196. Although it must be granted that Luke-Acts is compiled well after the events it describes, is not exhaustive in its account of the spread of Christianity, is influenced by stylistic and theological considerations, the significant contribution of Holl has been to recognise that in the Epistles as well as in Acts, there is a "Jerusalem frame to all of Paul's ministry". This viewpoint has been accepted and expanded by such scholars as J. Wagenmann, *op. cit.*, 42-44; E. Lohmeyer, *Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie*, pp. 171-179; E.F. Scott, *The Beginnings of the Church*, pp. 253-255; 264-267; S.G.F. Brandon, *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 19; and in a valuable section by J. Munck, *P.H.*, pp. 280-282.

Several significant observations emerge from this discussion: (1) Jerusalem marks the starting place of the mission of the church and is therefore considered by Paul to be the

the point from which his own mission begins, Ro. 15.19, 26, 27. Cf. Extended Note 7, p. 248. (2) Paul comes to see that unless his message and ministry correspond and relate to the mission of the primitive church they will be *εἰς κενόν*, Gal. 2.2. Cf. Extended Note 6, p. 247. Though he vehemently asserts his independent call and commission, Paul nevertheless recognises the authority of Jerusalem in matters of doctrine and policy. He must appeal to the Jerusalem apostles to demonstrate that he has no need to appeal, Gal. 1.11 - 2.10. (3) He returns to Jerusalem following each important phase of his mission. The reliability of Acts in this regard can be inferred from Paul's perspective in Ro. 15.17-29, where he considers Spain to be his next field of labour, but intends to go first to Jerusalem. As J. Munck, *P.H.*, pp. 296-298 has noted, his purpose obviously transcends the delivery of the money since a large delegation has already been appointed for this task. The collection therefore is a supreme illustration of the significance of Jerusalem in Paul's thought. Vide T.H. Campbell, "Paul's Missionary Journeys as Reflected in His Letters," *J.B.L.*, LXXIV (1955), 80-87 for an effective presentation of the way in which the Epistles confirm rather than condemn the Acts account of the progress and stages of Paul's mission. (4) Just as the decisive events of God's salvation in Christ transpired in Jerusalem so Paul sees the Holy City as the scene of the culmination of history and final victory of God, II Th. 2.1-12; Ro. 11.26, 27. The reference to "the Jerusalem above, ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ, Gal. 4.26, reveals his familiarity with the Jewish expectation of the new heaven and the new earth: The future kingdom of God shall extend to all the nations, but the seat of God's authority is the Jerusalem which comes from above and is established on the site of the former city, while the place of God's presence is the restored and purified Temple, Is. 52.1; 54.11-17; 60.10-14; Ezk. 40-48; Hg. 2.6-9; Zech. 2.1-13; Enoch 90.28,29 (*A.P.*, II, 259); Syriac Baruch 4.2-7 (*A.P.*, II, 482) II Esdras 7.26; 8.52; 10.25-59; 13.33-36; Tob. 13.16-18; Rv. 21.10-27. Cf. R.H. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 222, 223; P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, pp. 371-378; G.F. Moore, *op. cit.*, II, 300, 341, 342.

However, although this background undoubtedly heightened Paul's regard for Jerusalem, Holl and Lohmeyer, *loc. cit.*, have emphasized the apostle's particular faith in the risen Christ and his unique understanding of God's Spirit. To Paul each individual believer and each Christian community is the locus of the presence of God, and therefore any static institutional authority based on a priority of person or place is repudiated. In Holl's view this concept of the church is what distinguishes Paul from the original apostles who ground their authority in part on the primacy of Jerusalem. Thus also B. Sundkler, *op. cit.*, p. 86. We have examples of the superior position of the original apostles in the *ἐπιστολὰν ἀποστόλων*, II Cor. 11.5; 12.11, and the *οὐρεῖς*, Gal. 2.1-10, but in opposition to Holl at this point, it is evident from Paul's language and attitude in both these cases that the claim of priority did not originate with the apostles themselves, but was made for them by their more radical followers. Vide. above, pp. 96-99; Extended Note 1, p. 242.

CONCLUSION

We can now attempt to answer the three sets of questions which we posed in the Introduction.

(1) From the perspective of his conversion and vocational consciousness does Paul conceive himself to be a person called to a special ministry which he connects with God's plan of salvation in the time before the End? Yes: Paul's descriptions of his conversion demonstrate that Damascus involves a sudden revelation of God's purpose for the world, and the summoning of the apostle to a responsibility within this purpose. There develops out of the initial experience a clearly defined concept of commission, in that Paul considers himself charged with a specialized task, a pioneer mission to the Gentiles, which coincides with God's final provision of salvation and which is only fulfilled with the coming of Christ.

(2) Does the New Testament idea of the "apostle" support the view that Paul initiates the concept of a person commissioned by Christ for world mission in the last days? Is this allegedly unique Pauline sense of "apostle" then applied to Peter and gradually to all the Twelve? No: Paul's struggle for equality as an apostle demonstrates that this designation is present in the church from the beginning and that it refers among others to the Twelve. The term particularly denotes the individuals who were commissioned by the risen Christ to act as his authorized representatives in a mission to all mankind in the time before the parousia.

(3) Do the relations between Paul and the other leaders of the early church reveal a difference of eschatological viewpoint and a division of mission responsibility and territory? Does Paul's pursuit of his own task indicate that he regards his work as determinative for "The Fullness of the Gentiles", the conversion of Israel, and the return of Christ? No: Paul and the pillar apostles are united in the gospel which they proclaim, in their common debt to Jews and Gentiles, and in the world-wide responsibility which they contemplate. They agree to conduct the mission in a partnership recognising no differences except the particular way in which God has endowed each man. Paul's own special part in this mission contributes to the divine plan of salvation in the last days, but the determination of the final events transcends the work of Paul and resides ultimately in God himself.

SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET

NOTE 1

We cannot conclude from Acts 7.58; 8.1-3 that Paul's persecution was restricted to the Hellenists as opposed to the entire church. Its object as stated in 8.1 was the church of Jerusalem, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, and its effect was to scatter all, πάντες, except the apostles, πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων. Similarly in the later accounts which Paul gives of his pre-conversion period no distinction is made between Hebrews and Hellenists. In Acts 22.4 he persecutes the Way, τὴν ὁδόν. In Acts 26.9 his action is directed against the name of Jesus, τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ, and in both these passages we receive the impression of a persecution concentrating upon the whole Jerusalem church and subsequently spreading through the surrounding area. E. Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955, pp. 251, 252. This viewpoint is confirmed by the Epistles where in I Cor. 15.9, Gal. 1.13 and Phil. 3.6, Paul states simply that he persecuted the church.

In Paul's struggle to maintain the purity of Jewish faith in view of the heresy of Christ, the Hellenists would undoubtedly have appeared as the

greatest threat. Probably they were most vociferous in the opinion that the gospel must be taken to the countries of the diaspora. Cf. below, pp. 159, 160. Already they had drawn radical conclusions concerning the place of the Temple now that Messiah had come, Acts 3.1; 4.1; 5.25. R. Liechtenhan, Die Urchristliche Mission, pp. 48-55; B. Reicke, Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde, Zurich; Zwingli Verlag, 1957, pp. 169-171. Nevertheless Paul's rejection of Christ determined him to act not only against the Hellenists but against all who were committed to this name, just as his conversion to Christ represented a reverse in his attitude not to a segment of the church but to the whole Christian community.

Taking this view of the persecution, there is no reason to doubt the connection of Paul with the martyrdom of Stephen which appears in Acts 7.58 and which is included in Paul's speech in Acts 22.20. Contra. M. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 207, 208. The close relation of this detail with the narrative of Paul's conversion suggests that in the author's mind, the death of Stephen made a profound impression upon the persecutor of the church. Certainly the violence and antagonism of Paul's persecution does not preclude a subconscious attraction to the Christian

faith arising out of his contact with Stephen and other believers. M. Smith, "Pauline Problems," Harvard Theological Review, L, 108, 109. But on the other hand we are attaching too much significance to this subconscious attraction to Christianity in the mind of Paul if we use this factor to explain either the intensity of his persecution or the authenticity of his experience on the Damascus road. The intensity of his persecution is a natural development from his zeal for the Law and the authenticity of the Damascus experience is based simply upon a revelation of Christ.

NOTE 2

We must not forget that Paul sees his particular responsibility as an aspect of the work of the church. As a witness to the resurrection and a recipient of a special commission, he claims to share the unique function of the apostle and he identifies himself with the other apostles of Christ. But beyond this unique apostolate, Paul locates his task in the wider context of the ministry which Christ commits to the whole church. This is especially evident in his use of the terms, *ἐλάκωρος* and *ἐλακωρία*.

H.W. Beyer, "*ἐλακωρεύω*," T.W.N.T., II, 88, 89 speaks of the "free application of *ἐλάκωρος*" in the

New Testament, and in Paul's Epistles this varied usage is readily apparent. Cf. above, p. 66, nt. 2. A person can be the servant or minister of spiritual powers, for instance τοῦ σατανᾶ, τῆς δικαιοσύνης, II Cor. 11.14f.; τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Eph. 3.6f.; Col. 1.23; τῆς ἀρπαγῆς, Gal. 2.17; περιτομῆς, Ro. 15.8; καινῆς διαθηκῆς, II Cor. 3.6. The ministry of the household of Stephanas to the saints is a διακονία, and so also is the gift of the Gentile churches to the church of Jerusalem, II Cor. 8.4; 9.1,12; Ro. 15.31. Timothy, I Th. 3.2, Apollos, I Cor. 3.5, Ephrafras, Col. 1.7, Tychicus are all called ἐλάκονοι. The intruders of II Cor. 10-13 are connected with the ἐλάκονοι of Satan, 11.15 and then designated the ἐλάκονοι of Christ in 11.21. Ro. 13.4 uses ἐλάκονος of the political official who maintains order within society.

Within the church it is Christ himself who is the master of the ἐλάκονοι and who gives unity to the many διακονίαι. "There are varieties of service, but the same Lord," καὶ διαίρεσεις διακονιῶν εἰσιν, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος, I Cor. 12.5 demonstrates that each Christian was given a service to render in the cause of Christ, and as A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, p. 304

o observes, "We must not allow the development of a special order of *διακονον* to obscure the truth that the whole community and every individual member of it were a ministry which participated in the one ministry of Christ."

Paul considers his pioneer mission to the Gentiles to be the service which Christ has assigned to him, Ro. 11.13, *ἐφ' ὅσον πρὸς οὖν εἶμι ἐπὶ ἔθνων ἀπόστολος, τὴν διακονίαν μου ἐοξάζω*. Cf. also I Cor. 3.5; II Cor. 4.1; 6.3; Col. 1.23-25; Phil. 1.1. Thus in the sense that Paul is a *διάκονος* of Christ exercising a specific *διακονία*, he attaches no more significance to himself and his work than to any other member or any other service within the church. P.S. Minear, "Paul the Apostle," Interpreters Bible, VII, 203, 204. In placing the major emphasis upon the unique aspects of the strategy and objectives of Paul's mission, Cullmann, Fridrichsen, and Munck have not given sufficient attention to the fact that Paul sees his work both in the wider context of the commission which Christ gives to the apostles and in the still wider context of the *διακονία* entrusted to the whole church, II Cor. 5.18.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

I

Primary Sources

- Acta Apostolorum, Apocrypha, ed. C. Tischendorf, Lipsiae: Avenarius et Mendelssohn, 1851.
- The Apocalypse of Abraham, ed. and trans. G.H. Box, London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1918.
- The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, ed. R.H. Charles, 2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- The Apocryphal New Testament, ed. and trans. M.R. James, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.
- The Apostolic Fathers, ed. J.B. Lightfoot, J.R. Harmer, 1 vol. ed., London: Macmillan, 1898.
- Aristides, Apologia, ed. J.R. Harris, J.A. Robinson, Cambridge: University Press, 1893.
- The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I Epstein, London: Soncino Press, 1936.
- The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Marks Monastery, I, II:2, ed. M. Burrows, New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950, 51.
- Flavii Josephi Opera, ed. G. Dindorfius, 2 vols., Paris: Firmin Didot, 1845.
- Fragments of an Unknown Gospel, ed. H.I. Bell, Oxford: University Press, 1935.
- Hieronymus, Liber De Viris Illustribus, ed. E.C. Richardson, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, O. Gebhardt, A. Harnack, XIV, I, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1896.
- The Loeb Classical Library, ed. E. Capps, T.E. Page, W.H.D. Rouse, London: William Heinemann.
- Midrash Rabbah, trans. and ed. H. Freedman, M. Simon, London: Soncino Press, 1939.
- Osar Hammegillot Haggenuzot, ed. E.L. Sukenik, N. Avigad, Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and the Hebrew University, 1954.
- Patrologiae, ed. J.P. Migne, Series Graeca, Series Latina, Parisiis: Garnier, 1857ff.

Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, trans. G. Friedlander, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1916.

Pistis Sophia, ed. M.G. Schwartz, J.H. Petermann, Berolini: Ferd. Duemmleri Libraria, 1851.

S. Clement of Rome, The Apostolic Fathers, ed. J.B. Lightfoot, Pt. I, I, London: Macmillan, 1890.

An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel, ed. C.H. Roberts, Manchester: University Press, 1935.

Urkunden der Ptolemaerzeit, ed. U. Wilcken, I, Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1923.

The Zadokite Documents, ed. and trans. C. Rabin, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.

II

Secondary Sources

Abbott, T.K., Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians, International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.

Allo, E.B., "La Portée de la Collecte pour Jérusalem dans les Plans de Saint Paul," Revue Biblique (1936).

Arndt, W.F., Gingrich, F.W., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Baird, W., "What is the Kerygma? A Study of I Cor. 15.3-8 and Gal. 1.11-17," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (1957).

Barclay, W., The Mind of Paul, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Barr, J., "Revelation" (to be published).

Barrett, C.K., The Epistle to the Romans, Black's New Testament Commentaries, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1959.

_____. "Paul and the 'Pillar' Apostles," Studia Paulina, Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn, 1953.

Bartlet, J.V., "Paul," Encyclopaedia Britannica, XVII, London; Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1957.

Bartlett, W., "St. Paul and the Twelve," Expository Times, XXXIX (1927,28).

Bauer, W., Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1920.

_____, Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1934.

Baur, F.C., Paul, trans. E. Zeller, I, London: Williams and Norgate, 1873.

Beare, F.W., The Epistle to the Philippians, Black's New Testament Commentaries, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1959.

_____, The First Epistle of St. Peter, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.

Bell, H.I., Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1953.

_____, Jews and Christians in Egypt, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Benoit, P., "L'Ascension," Revue Biblique, LVI (1949).

Bigg, C., Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.

Bonnard, P., "Build," Vocabulary of the Bible, ed. J.J. Von Allmen, trans. comm., London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

_____, L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Galates, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, Paris: Delachaux & Nestle, 1935.

Bousset, W., The Antichrist Legend, trans. A.H. Keane, London: Hutchinson, 1896.

_____, Der Brief an die Galater, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, II, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908.

_____, Der zweite Brief an die Korinther, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908.

Brandon, S.G.F., The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church, London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1951.

Bruce, F.F., Commentary on the Book of the Acts, London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1954.

Bultmann, R., Theology of the New Testament, trans. K. Grobel, I, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

- _____, "Zur Frage nach den Quellen der Apostelgeschichte," New Testament Essays, Manchester: University Press, 1959.
- Burkitt, F.C., Christian Beginnings, London: University of London Press, 1924.
- Burton, E.D., The Epistle to the Galatians, International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921.
- _____, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1894.
- Cadbury, H.J., The Book of Acts in History, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1955.
- _____, "Roman Law and the Trial of Paul," The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F.J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, Pt. I, V, London: Macmillan, 1933.
- _____, "The Speeches in Acts," The Beginnings of Christianity ed. F.J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, Pt. I, V, London: Macmillan, 1920.
- Calder, W.M., "Studies in Early Christian Epigraphy," Journal of Roman Studies, X (1920).
- Campbell, J.Y., "KOINONIA and its Cognates in the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, LI (1932).
- Campbell, T.H., "Paul's Missionary Journeys as Reflected in His Letters," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIV (1955).
- Case, S.J., "Paul's Historical Relation to the First Disciples," American Journal of Theology, XI (1907).
- Chadwick, H., "St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome: The Problem of the Memoria Apostolorum ad Catacumbas," Journal of Theological Studies, VIII (1957).
- Charles, R.H., Eschatology, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913.
- Chase, F.H., "Peter, Second Epistle," Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, III.
- Cullmann, O., "A New Approach to the Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel," Expository Times, LXXI (1959).
- _____, "Le caractere eschatologique du devoir missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de S. Paul," Revue d'histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, (1936).
- _____, Christ and Time, trans. F.V. Filson, London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1951.
- _____, The Early Church, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1956.

- _____, "Eschatology and Missions in the New Testament,"
The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology,
ed. W.D. Davies, D. Daube, Cambridge, 1956.
- _____, Peter, Disciple-Apostle-Martyr, trans. F.V. Filson,
London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1951.
- Dana, H.E., Mantey, J.R., A Manual Grammar of the Greek New
Testament, New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- Davies, J.G., He Ascended Into Heaven, London: Lutterworth
Press, 1958.
- Davies, W.D., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London: Society for the
Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1948.
- Deissmann, A., Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History,
trans. W.E. Wilson, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Dibelius, M., A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early
Christian Literature, no trans., London: Ivor Nicholson
and Watson, 1936.
- _____, An die Epheser, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament,
Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1911.
- _____, An Timotheus II, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament,
Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1911.
- _____, "The Apostolic Council," Studies in the Acts of the
Apostles, trans. M. Ling, London: Student Christian Movement
Press, 1956.
- _____, "The Conversion of Cornelius," Studies in the Acts of
the Apostles, trans. M. Ling, London: Student Christian
Movement Press, 1956.
- _____, From Tradition to Gospel, trans. B.L. Woolf, London:
Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934.
- _____, Thessalonicher I, II und Philipper, Handbuch zum
Neuen Testament, Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1911.
- _____, Kummel, W.G., Paul, trans. F. Clarke, London:
Longmans, Green, 1935.
- Dinkler, E., "Earliest Christianity," The Idea of History in the
Ancient Near East, ed. R.C. Dentan, New Haven: Yale University
Press, 1955.
- Dix, G., "The Ministry in the Early Church," The Apostolic
Ministry, ed. K.E. Kirk, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946.
- Dobschütz, E., Ostern und Pfingsten, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1903.

- _____, Die Thessalonicher Brief, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1909.
- Dodd, C.H., The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.
- _____, "The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form Criticism of the Gospels," Studies in the Gospels, ed. D.E. Nineham, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- _____, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, Moffatt New Testament Commentary, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1940.
- _____, "Matthew and Paul," New Testament Studies, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953.
- _____, The Meaning of Paul for Today, London: Swarthmore Press, 1920.
- _____, "The Mind of Paul: A Psychological Approach," The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XVII (1933).
- _____, "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development," The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XVIII (1934).
- Duncan, G.S., The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, Moffatt New Testament Commentary, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1934.
- _____, St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1929.
- Easton, B.S., The Purpose of Acts, London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1936.
- Farrar, A.M., "The Ministry in the New Testament," The Apostolic Ministry, ed. K.E. Kirk, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946.
- Farrar, F.W., The Life and Work of St. Paul, London: Cassell, 1891.
- Feine, P., Der Apostel Paulus, Gutersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928.
- _____, Der Römerbrief, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903.
- Foerster, W., "Die δοκοῦντες in Gal. 2," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXVI (1937).
- Fridrichsen, A., "The Apostle and His Message," Inbjudningar till Doktorspromotionerna, I (1947).
- Friedrich, G., "εὐαγγέλιον," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, II, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935.
- Gaechter, P., Petrus und seine Zeit, Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1958.

- Gapp, K.S., "The Universal Famine under Claudius," Harvard Theological Review, XXVII (1935).
- Gardner, P., The Religious Experience of St. Paul, London: Williams and Norgate, 1913.
- Gaster, T.H., The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, London: Secker & Warburg, 1957.
- Gealy, F.D., "The Exegesis of the First and Second Epistles to Timothy" The Interpreters Bible, XI, New York: Abingdon, 1955.
- Gerkan, A., "Die Forschung nach dem Grab Petri," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentlich Wissenschaft, XLIV (1952, 53).
- Goguel, M., The Birth of Christianity, trans. H.C. Snape, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1953.
- _____, La Foi a la Resurrection de Jesus dans le Christianisme Primitif, Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux, 1933.
- _____, "Remarques sur un aspect de la conversion de Paul," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIII (1934).
- Goodspeed, E.J., A History of Early Christian Literature, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- Grundmann, W., "Die Apostel zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIV (1940).
- Guignebert, C., The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, trans. S.H. Hooke, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1939.
- Guillaume, A., Prophecy and Divination, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- Gunkel, H., Schöpfung und Chaos, Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895.
- Hamilton, N.Q., The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul, Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Harnack, A., The Acts of the Apostles, trans. J.R. Wilkinson, London: Williams & Norgate, 1909.
- _____, Die Chronologie der altchristliche Literatur, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1897.
- _____, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, trans. and ed. J. Moffatt, I, London: Williams and Norgate, 1904.
- Harrison, P.N., The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921.

- Hauck, F., "κοινωνός," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, III, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.
- Haupt, E., Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1897.
- Heinrici, G., Das erste Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Korinther, Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1880.
- Hering, J., La Première Épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, 1949.
- _____, La Seconde Épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, 1949.
- Heussi, K., War Petrus wirklich römischer Märtyrer?, Leipzig: Leopold Klotz, 1937.
- Hirsch, E., "Die drei Berichte der Apostelgeschichte über die Bekehrung des Paulus," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXVIII (1929).
- _____, "Petrus und Paulus," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXIX (1930).
- Holl, K., "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde," Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, II, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1928.
- Holsten, C., Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus, Rostock: Stiller, 1868.
- Holtzmann, H.J., Die Apostelgeschichte, Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, I, Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1892.
- Hort, F.J.A., The First Epistle of St. Peter, London: Macmillan, 1898.
- Hunt, A.S., "Lexical Notes from the Papyri," Expositor, VII (1909).
- Hunter, A.M., Paul and His Predecessors, London: Nicholson & Watson, 1940.
- _____, The Unity of the New Testament, London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1943.
- Inglis, G.J., "The Problem of St. Paul's Conversion," Expository Times, XL (1929).
- _____, "St. Paul's Conversion in His Epistles," Theology, XXIV (1937).
- Jackson, F.J.F., Peter: Prince of Apostles, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1927.

- Jackson, F.J.F., Lake, K., "The Disciples in Jerusalem," The Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I, I, London: Macmillan, 1920.
- _____, "The Internal Evidence of Acts," The Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I, II, London: Macmillan, 1922.
- _____, "The Zealots," The Beginnings of Christianity, Pt. I, I, London: Macmillan, 1920.
- Jacob, E.I., "Paul," The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. I. Landman, VIII, 1948.
- Jeremias, J., The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. A. Ehrhardt, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- _____, Jesus Promise to the Nations, trans. S.H. Hooke, London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1958.
- _____, "Mc. 14.9," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIV (1952, 53).
- _____, "Untersuchungen zum Quellen problem der Apostelgeschichte," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXVI (1937).
- Johnson, S.E., "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K. Stendahl, London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1958.
- Käsemann, E., "Die Legitimität des Apostels," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLI (1942).
- Kennedy, H.A.A., St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913.
- _____, St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1904.
- Kennedy, J.H., The Second and Third Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, London: Methuen, 1900.
- Kilpatrick, G.D., "The Gentile Mission in Mark and Mark 13.9-11," Studies in the Gospels, ed. D.E. Nineham, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Kinsey, A.B., "The Triumph Joy," Expository Times, XXI (1909, 10).
- Kittel, G., "Θεσπρον," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, III, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.
- _____, "Die Stellung des Jakobus zu Judentum und Heidentum," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXX (1931).
- Kittel, R., The Religion of the People of Israel, trans. R. C. Mickletham, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1925.

- Klausner, J., From Jesus to Paul, trans. W.F. Stinespring, New York: Macmillan, 1944.
- Knight, H., The Hebrew Prophetic Consciousness, London: Lutterworth Press, 1947.
- Knopf, R., Die Briefe Petri Judä, H.A.W. Meyer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912.
- _____, Der erste Clemensbrief, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1920.
- _____, Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1920.
- Knox, J., Chapters in a Life of Paul, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1954.
- _____, "Pliny and I Peter," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXII (1953).
- Knox, W.L., St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925.
- _____, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939.
- Koch, H., "Zur Jakobus frage, Gal. 1.19," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXIII (1934).
- Kohler, F., Die Pastoralbriefe, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1908.
- Krauss, S., "Die Judischen Apostel," Jewish Quarterly Review, XVII (1905).
- Kummel, W.G., "Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche," Studia Theologica, VII-VIII (1953,54).
- Lagrangé, M., Épître aux Romains, Etudes Bibliques, Paris: J. Gabalda, 1950.
- Lake, K., "The Apostolic Council of Jerusalem," The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F.J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, Pt. I, V, London: Macmillan, 1933.
- _____, "The Ascension," The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F.J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, Pt. I, V, London: Macmillan, 1933.
- _____, "The Conversion of Paul," The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F.J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, Pt. I, V, London: Macmillan, 1933.
- _____, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, London: Rivingtons, 1911.
- _____, "The Twelve and the Apostles," The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F.J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, Pt. I, V, London: Macmillan, 1933.

- Lake, K., Cadbury, H.J., Translation and Commentary, The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. J.F. Jackson, K. Lake, Pt. I, IV, London: Macmillan, 1933.
- Lebreton, J., Zeiller, J., The History of the Primitive Church, trans. E.C. Messenger, I, London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1942.
- Liddell, H.G., Scott, R., A Greek-English Lexicon, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Liechtenhan, R., Die urchristliche Mission, Zurich: Zwingli, 1946.
- Lietzmann, H., An die Römer, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1919.
- _____, The Beginnings of the Christian Church, trans. B.L. Woolf, London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1937.
- _____, Galaterbrief, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr, 1910.
- _____, Korinther I, II, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1923.
- _____, Petrus und Paulus in Rom, Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1927.
- Lightfoot, J.B., Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, London: Macmillan, 1895.
- _____, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, London: Macmillan, 1905.
- _____, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, London: Macmillan, 1885.
- Lightfoot, R.H., Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938.
- Linton, O., "The Third Aspect. A Neglected Point of View," Studia Theologica, III-IV (1949, 50).
- Lipsius, R.A., Der Brief an die Galater, Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, II, Freiburg: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1893.
- Lohmeyer, E., Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1930.
- _____, Grundlagen paulinischer Theologie, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1929.
- Loisy, A., The Birth of the Christian Religion, trans. L.P. Jacks, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1948.

- Lueken, W., Die Briefe an Philemon, an die Kolosser und an die Epheser, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1908.
- Luther, M., Epistle to the Galatians, no trans., London: William Tegg, 1875.
- Macgregor, W.M., Christian Freedom, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914.
- McNeile, A.H., An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927.
- Machen, J.G., The Origin of Paul's Religion, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938.
- Manson, T.W., The Church's Ministry, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1948.
- _____, "St. Paul in Ephesus: The Corinthian Correspondence," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXVI (1942).
- Manson, W., The Epistle to the Hebrews, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1951.
- Masson, C., L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Ephésiens, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1953.
- Merrill, E.T., Essays in Early Christian History, London: Macmillan, 1924.
- Meyer, E., Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, 3 Bde., Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta, 1923.
- Michaelis, W., Die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen, Basel: Heinrich Majer, 1944.
- _____, Das Neue Testament, II, Leipzig: Alfred Kroner, 1935.
- _____, "ὁπώρα," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, V, Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1954.
- Michel, O., "οἰκοδομῶ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, V, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1954.
- Milik, J.T., Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea, trans. J. Strugnell, London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1959.
- Milligan, G., "The Eschatology of II Thessalonians 2.1-12," Expositor, XII (1905).
- Mitton, C.L., "E.J. Goodspeed's Theory Regarding the Origin of Ephesians," Expository Times, LX (1948, 49).
- _____, "The Relationship between I Peter and Ephesians," Journal of Theological Studies, I (1950).

- Moffatt, J., The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, Moffatt New Testament Commentary, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938.
- _____, The General Epistles, Moffatt New Testament Commentary, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928.
- Moore, G.F., Judaism, 3 vols., Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Moule, C.F.D., An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek, Cambridge: University Press, 1959.
- Moulton, J.H., Milligan, G., The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1949.
- Muilenburg, J., "Introduction, Chs. 40-66," The Interpreters Bible, V, New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.
- Munck, J., Christus und Israel, Kobenhavn: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1956.
- _____, "Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament," Journal of Theological Studies, II (1951).
- _____, "Paul, the Apostles, and the Twelve," Studia Theologica, III-IV (1949, 50).
- _____, "Paulus tanquam abortivus, I Cor. 15.8," New Testament Essays, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, Manchester: University Press, 1959.
- _____, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte, Kobenhavn: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1954.
- Murray, G.R.B., A Commentary on Mark Thirteen, London: Macmillan, 1957.
- Nash, H.S., "Paul the Apostle," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, ed. S.M. Jackson, VIII, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1910.
- Neil, W., The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, Moffatt New Testament Commentary, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1950.
- Nock, A.D., St. Paul, London: Thornton Butterworth, 1933.
- North, C.R., The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, London: Oxford University Press, 1948.
- Oepke, A., "καλόπρω," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, III, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938.
- Oesterley, W.O.E., Robinson, T.W., Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development, London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1931.
- The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, ed. F.L. Cross, London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

- Pace, E., Ideas of God in Israel, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1924.
- Parkes, J., Jesus, Paul and the Jews, London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1936.
- Peake, A.S., "The Quintessence of Paulinism," The Servant of Yahweh, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1931.
- Pfaff, P.E., Die Bekehrung des H. Paulus in der Exegese des 20 Jahrhunderts, Rom: Officium Libri Catholici, 1942.
- Pfleiderer, O., Paulinism, trans. E. Peters, 2 vols., London: Williams & Norgate, 1877.
- Plummer, A., Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915.
- Pope, R.M., "Studies in Pauline Vocabulary," Expository Times, XXI (1909, 10).
- Porteous, N.W., "Prophecy," Record and Revelation, ed. H.W. Robinson, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Quispel, G., "The Jung Codex and its Significance," The Jung Codex, ed. F.L. Cross, London: A.R. Mowbray, 1955.
- Ramsay, W.M., The Church in the Roman Empire, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1893.
- _____, Luke the Physician, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1908.
- _____, St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1895.
- Reike, B., "The Risen Lord and His Church," Interpretation, XIII (1959).
- Rendall, F., "The Pauline Collection for the Saints," Expositor, VIII (1893).
- Rengstorff, K.H., Apostleship, trans. J.R. Coates, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952.
- Reumann, J., "Stewards of God - Pre-Christian Religious Application of οἰκονόμος in Greek," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXVII (1958).
- Richardson, A., An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1958.
- Riddle, D.W., Paul, Man of Conflict, Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1940.
- Riesenfeld, H., The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings, London: A.R. Mowbray, 1957.

- Riesenfeld, H., "The Ministry in the New Testament," The Root of the Vine, ed. A.G. Hebert, London: Dacre Press, 1953.
- Rigaux, B., Les Epitres aux Thessaloniens, Etudes Bibliques, Paris: J. Gabalda, 1956.
- Robertson, A., Plummer, A., First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911.
- Robertson, A.T., A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of Historical Research, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914.
- Robinson, H.W., Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- _____, The Old Testament, Its Making and Meaning, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937.
- Robinson, J.A., Barnabas, Hermas and the Didache, London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1920.
- _____, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London: Macmillan, 1904.
- Robinson, J.A.T., The Body, London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1955.
- Ropes, J.H., The Apostolic Age, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1906.
- _____, "The Singular Problem of the Epistle of Galatians," Harvard Theological Studies, XIV (1929).
- Rowley, H.H., The Biblical Doctrine of Election, London: Lutterworth Press, 1950.
- _____, Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls, London: Athlone Press, 1958.
- _____, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, London: Lutterworth Press, 1944.
- _____, The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament, London: Lutterworth, 1952.
- Russell, R., "Modern Exegesis and the Fact of the Resurrection," The Downside Review, LXXVI (1958).
- Sabatier, A., The Apostle Paul, trans. A.M. Hellier, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1899..
- Sanday, W., Headlam, A.C., The Epistle to the Romans, International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905.
- Sanders, J.N., "Peter and Paul in the Acts," New Testament Studies, II (1955, 56).

- Sass, G., Apostelamt und Kirche, Munchen: Chr. Kaiser, 1934.
- Schlatter, A., Gottes Gerechtigkeit, Stuttgart: Calwer, 1935.
- _____, Paulus, der Bote Jesu, Stuttgart: Calwer, 1934.
- Schlechter, S., Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1909.
- Schlier, H., Der Brief an die Galater, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951.
- Schmiedel, P. W., Die Briefe an die Korinther, Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, II, Freiburg: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1893.
- Schneider, J., "ἐκπαίδευσις," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, II, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935.
- Schoeps, H.J., Paulus, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1959.
- Schulthess, O., "Μετονομασία," Paulys Real-Encyclopädie, ed. G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, XV, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 1932.
- Schweitzer, A., The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. W. Montgomery, London: A. & C. Black, 1931.
- Scott, C.A.A., Christianity According to St. Paul, Cambridge: University Press, 1927.
- Scott, E.F., The Beginnings of the Church, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.
- _____, The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians, Moffatt New Testament Commentary, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1948.
- _____, "Exegesis of Philippians," The Interpreters Bible, XI, New York: Abingdon Press, 1955.
- _____, The Pastoral Epistles, Moffatt New Testament Commentary, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1939.
- Seesemann, H., Der Begriff KOINONIA im Neuen Testament, Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1933.
- Selwyn, E.G., The First Epistle of St. Peter, London, Macmillan, 1946.
- Seston, W., "L'Empereur Claude et les Chrétiens," Revue d'histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, (1931).
- Shurer, E., A History of the Jewish People, trans. S. Taylor, P. Christie, Pt. II, II, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.
- Skinner, J., Prophecy and Religion, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.

- Smith, M., "Pauline Problems," Harvard Theological Review, L (1957).
- Spicq, P.C., Les Épitres Pastorales, Études Biblique, Paris: J. Gabalda, 1947.
- Stauffer, E., New Testament Theology, trans. J. Marsh, New York: Macmillan, 1955.
- Stewart, J.S., A Man in Christ, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- Strachan, R.H., The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, Moffatt New Testament Commentary, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.
- Strack, H.L., Billerbeck, P., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, 4 Bde., München: C.H. Beck, 1922ff.
- Strathmann, H., " λειτουργία " Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, IV, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942.
- Straub, W., Die Bildersprache des Apostels Paulus, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1937.
- Streeter, B.H., "The Much-Belaboured Diache," Journal of Theological Studies, XXXVII (1936).
- _____, The Primitive Church, London: Macmillan, 1929.
- Stumpff, A., " εἶδος " Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, II, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935.
- Sundkler, B., "Jesus et les Païens," Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, (1936).
- Taylor, V., "The Church and the Ministry," Expository Times, LXII (1950, 51).
- _____, The Gospel According to St. Mark, London: Macmillan, 1952.
- Toynbee, J.M.C., Perkins, J.W., The Shrine of St. Peter, London: Longmans, Green, 1956.
- Turner, C.H., "St. Peter in the New Testament," Theology, XIII, (1926).
- Turner, H.E.W., Jesus Master and Lord, London: A.R. Mowbray, 1954.
- Vincent, M.R., The Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon, International Critical Commentary, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.
- Vokes, E., The Riddle of the Didache, London: Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, 1938.
- Volz, P., Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1934.

- Volz, P., Prophetengestalten des Alten Testaments, Stuttgart: Calwer, 1938.
- Wagenmann, J., Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf, Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1926.
- Weinel, H., St. Paul, The Man and His Work, trans. G.A. Bienemann, London: Williams & Norgate, 1906.
- Weiss, B., Apostelgeschichte, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893.
- _____, Die Paulinischen Briefe, Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1902.
- _____, Philipper-Brief, Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1895.
- Weiss, J., Der erste Korintherbrief, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- _____, The History of Primitive Christianity, trans. and ed. F.C. Grant, 2 vols, London: Macmillan, 1937.
- Weizacker, C., The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, trans. J. Millar, 2 vols. London: Williams & Norgate, 1894.
- Wendland, H.D., Die Briefe an die Korinther, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.
- Wendland, P., Die Urchristlichen Literaturformen, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, I, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1912.
- Wendt, H.H., Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1880.
- Werner, M., The Formation of Christian Dogma, trans. S.G.F. Brandon, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1955.
- Wernle, P., The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. W.D. Morrison, trans. G.A. Bienemann, 2 vols., New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1903.
- Wetter, G., Charis, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ältesten Christentums, Leipzig: Oscar Brandstetter, 1913.
- White, N.J.D., The First and Second Epistles to Timothy, The Expositor's Greek Testament, IV, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1910.
- Wikenhauser, A., "Die Wirkung der Christophanie vor Damaskus auf Paulus und seine Begleiter nach den Berichten der Apostelgeschichte," Biblica, XXXIII (1952).
- Williams, C.S.C., A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, Black's New Testament Commentaries, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957.

Windisch, H., Die Katholischen Briefe, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Tübingen, J.C.B. Mohr, 1911.

_____, Der zweite Korintherbrief, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1924.

Yadin, Y., The Message of the Scrolls, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1957.

Zahn, T., Introduction to the New Testament, trans. comm., I, II, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.